871
Y58Yh2

COORDINATION

OF

NON-COORDINATE ELEMENTS

IN VERGIL

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

/871V58YH2>C1/

DATE DUE			

29390
Hahn

St. Procopius College Library
Maple Ave. and College Road
Lisle, Illinois

COORDINATION OF NON-COORDINATE ELEMENTS IN VERGIL

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, IN THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

By

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

Assistant Professor of Latin and Greek
Hunter College of the City of New York

Theodore Lownik Library
Illinois Benedictine College
Lisle, IL 60532

GENEVA, NEW YORK
W. F. HUMPHREY, PUBLISHER
1930

871
V58Yh2

Copyright, 1930,
by
E. Adelaide Hahn.

29390

TO MY MOTHER

ELEONORE FUNK HAHN

First, Best, Dearest of Teachers
First, Best, Dearest of Friends

PREFACE

In the investigation of a subject which, to the best of my knowledge and belief, has not been systematically treated before, it has not seemed necessary, in connection with each passage discussed, to present an exhaustive survey of all the wealth of critical and epexegetical material concerned therewith. Rather I have contented myself with the comments and summaries set forth in a few standard works of accepted value.

On textual questions, I have regularly referred to the Oxford Classical Text, edited by Hirtzel, occasionally supplementing this by reference to the Teubner Text, edited by Ribbeck*, which, as less conservative, seemed correspondingly less well adapted to my purposes. In all citations from Vergil, I have followed Hirtzel's text, save when I had some special reason for departing from his reading, spelling, or pointing. In all other matters, I have, as must every student of Vergil, found a treasure-house of incalculable value in the great Conington-Nettleship edition. In general the résumés given there of the views expressed by previous scholars have appeared to me sufficient for my needs; but of course for points of special interest I have not satisfied myself with these, but have gone directly to the earlier editors, notably Servius, whose views on what Vergil's Latin means are of special interest as coming from one to whom Latin was a native tongue; Wagner, whose discussions in his commentary, and still more in his Quaestiones Vergilianae, appear to me to be written with remarkable sagacity and subtlety; and the always original, ingenious, and stimulating Henry. Of more recent works, W. Warde Fowler's three delightful little volumes on the second part of the Aeneid, and Norden's brilliant edition of the sixth book, have of course been referred to; and I am particularly indebted to two volumes which, though published as school-editions, cannot but prove of the greatest value to scholars, and which I have constantly used to supplement Conington-Nettleship for the parts of Vergil that they include. The first is T. E. Page's edition of the Eclogues and Georgics, which seems to me marked by just that "scrupulous nicety of ex-

*The more recent Teubner Text, edited by G. Janell (1920), does not seem so valuable as that edited by Ribbeck. See the review by Tenney Frank, American Journal of Philology 45 (1924), 90–91.

amination" that Page himself in his Preface attributes to Conington. The second is Charles Knapp's edition of Aeneid I–VI and Selections from VII–XII, a remarkable model of all that an edition should be, wherein I have never sought without finding whatsoever I needed or wanted. This book has been particularly useful to me in the present undertaking, because the subject here under consideration is one to which the editor has paid special attention.

Indeed, it is from Professor Knapp that the suggestion originally came which led me to undertake the wider investigation of which this dissertation is but a part and an outgrowth. And it is to Professor Knapp that I am under an obligation heavier than I can say, for constant advice and assistance in connection with my endeavor to carry out that suggestion. How a scholar so busy with his own multifarious and arduous tasks of creative and critical work can at the same time devote so many hours to sharing his gifts and attainments with his pupils must forever remain an unsolved mystery—but a mystery that to this particular pupil, assuredly, has been the source of much enlightenment.

E. Adelaide Hahn

April 1, 1930.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE ..... *v–vi*

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... *vii–xii*

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... *xiii*

INTRODUCTION 1–4

I. Members Parallel Logically but not Grammatically 5–140
A. Examples Involving the Same Classes of Words 5–86

1. Non-Parallel Substantives 5–19
a. Substantives Differing in Number 5–7
b. Substantives Differing in Case Usage 7–19
(1) Substantives in the Same Case Used in Different Ways 7–9
(2) Substantives in Different Cases 10–15
(3) Substantives with and without Prepositions 15–18
(a) Both Substantives in the Ablative 15–17
(b) Ablative and Accusative 17
(c) Dative and Accusative 17–18
(4) Two Prepositional Phrases not Quite Parallel 18–19

2. Non-Parallel Verbs 19–36
a. Verbs Differing in Voice 19–21
(1) Finite Verbs 19
(2) Infinitives 19–21
b. Verbs Differing in Tense 21–31
(1) Indicative 22–27
(a) Present and Imperfect 22–24
(b) Present and Perfect 24–25
(c) Present and Pluperfect 25–26
(d) Present and Future or Future Perfect 26
(e) Perfect and Pluperfect 26–27
(2) Imperative 27
(a) Present and Future 27
(3) Subjunctive 28
(a) Imperfect and Pluperfect 28
(4) Infinitive 28–30
(a) Present and Past 28–30
(b) Present and Future 30
(5) Participles 31
(a) Present and Past 31
c. Verbs Differing in Mood Usage 31–36
(1) Verbs in the Same Mood Used in Different Ways 31
(2) Verbs in Different Moods 31–36
(a) Indicative and Infinitive 31–32
(b) Indicative and Subjunctive 32–33
(c) Indicative and Imperative 33–34
(d) Subjunctive and Imperative 34
(e) Subjunctive and Infinitive 35–36

3. No -Parallel Clauses 36–86
a. Relative Clause Coordinated with Following Non-Relative Clause 36–67
(1) Demonstrative Pronoun in Second Clause instead of Second Relative 41–47
(2) Relative Pronoun Understood in Second Clause 47–58
(a) A Nominative Pronoun to Be Supplied 48–49
1′. After an Accusative 48
2′. After a Dative 48–49
(b) An Accusative Pronoun to Be Supplied 49–52
1′. After a Nominative 50
2′. After a Dative 50–52
(c) An Ablative Pronoun to Be Supplied 52–53
1′. After a Dative 52–53
(d) A Dative Pronoun to Be Supplied 53–54
1′. After a Nominative 53
2′. After an Accusative 53–54
(e) A Genitive Pronoun to Be Supplied 54–58
1′. After a Dative 55
2′. After an Ablative 55
3′. After an Accusative 55–58
(3) No Pronoun to Be Supplied in Second Clause 58–67
(a) Second Clause = a Nominative Participle 58–62
1′. After an Accusative 58–60
2′. After a Dative 60
3′. After an Ablative 61
4′. After an Adverb 61–62
(b) Second Clause = an Ablative Absolute 62–67
1′. After an Accusative with a Verb 62–64
2′. After an Accusative with a Preposition 64–65
3′. After a Dative 65–66
4′. After a Genitive 66–67
b. Parenthetical Clause Coordinated with Preceding Dependent Member 67–77
(1) After a Dependent Clause 67–74
(a) Clause Introduced by a Relative Pronoun 70–74
(b) Clause Introduced by a Relative Adverb 74
(c) Clause Introduced by a Conjunction 74
(2) After a Dependent Word 74–77
(a) Adjectival Modifier 75
1′. Adjective 75
2′. Participle 75
(b) Adverbial Modifier 75–77
1′. Ablative of Means 75
2′. Ablative of Cause 75–77
c. Clause Coordinated with Another Clause with Which It Is Logically Coordinated Only in Part 77–83
d. Clauses Coordinated in Which There Is a Shift in Structure. 83–86
(1) Variety instead of Balance 83–85
(2) False Antithesis 85–86

B. Examples Involving Different Classes of Words 87–140
1. Nouns and Non-Nouns 87–127
a. Noun and Clause 87–100
(1) Noun and Main Clause 87–88
(2) Noun and Dependent Clause 88–98
(a) Relative Clause 88–93
1′. Noun a Special Type 89
a′. Noun Denoting the Agent 89
2′. Clause a Special Type 89–93
a′. Antecedent of Relative Incorporated in Clause 89–90
b′. Antecedent of Relative not Expressed 90–93
1″. Antecedent May Be Supplied 90–92
2″. Antecedent Cannot Be Supplied 92–93
(b) Interrogative Clause 93–98
1′. Clause Introduced by Interrogative Pronoun or Adjective 93–97
2′. Clause Introduced by Interrogative Adverb 97–98
(c) Purpose Clause 98
(3) Miscellaneous Peculiar Examples 98–100
(a) Noun in Genitive and Clause 98
(b) Noun in Ablative and Clause 98–99
1′. To Express Time 98
2′. To Express Cause 98–99
3′. To Express Means 99
(c) Noun and Clause Both Dependent on a Preposition 99
1′. To Express Time 99
(d) Noun but not Clause Dependent on a Preposition 99–100
1′. To Express Place 99
2′. To Express Place and Time, Respectively 100
3′. To Express Specification and Time, Respectively 100
b. Noun and Infinitive 100–113
(1) Noun in Nominative 100–101
(2) Noun in Genitive 101
(3) Noun in Dative 101
(4) Noun in Accusative with a Verb 101–112
(a) Infinitive without Subject Accusative 101–103
(b) Infinitive with Subject Accusative 103–112
(5) Noun in Accusative with a Preposition 112–113
c. Noun and Adjective 113–125
(1) Noun and Adjective in the Same Case 113–116
(2) Noun and Adjective in Different Cases 116–125
(a) Noun in Genitive 116
(b) Noun in Ablative 117–124
1′. Ablative = Adjective 117–118
a′. Ablative of Quality 117–118
2′. Ablative = Adverb 119–124
a′. Ablative of Accompaniment 119
b′. Ablative of Means 119–121
c′. Ablative of Cause 122

d′. Ablative of Attendant Circumstance 122–123
e′. Ablative of Time 123
f′. Ablative of Place 123–124
(c) Noun in Ablative with a Preposition 124–125
1′. Prepositional Phrase Expressing Place 124–125
(d) Noun in Accusative with a Preposition 125
1′. Prepositional Phrase Expressing Place 125
2′. Prepositional Phrase Expressing Time 125
d. Noun and Adverb 126–127
(1) Noun in Ablative 126
(a) Ablative of Means 126
(b) Ablative of Cause, or of Attendant Circumstance 126
(2) Noun in Ablative with a Preposition 126–127
(a) To Express Manner 127
(b) To Express Place 127
(3) Noun in Accusative with a Preposition 127
(a) To Express Place 127

2. Adjectives and Non-Adjectives 127–139
a. Adjective and Adverb 127–129
b. Adjective and Clause 129–139
(1) Adjective and Main Clause 129–136
(2) Adjective and Dependent Clause 136–139
(a) Clause Introduced by Relative Pronoun 137–138
(b) Clause Introduced by Relative Adjective 138
(c) Clause Introduced by Relative Adverb 138–139

3. Adverbs and Non-Adverbs 139–140
a. Adverb and Clause 139–140

II. Members Parallel Grammatically but not Logically 141–244
A. Examples Involving Different Types of Terms 141–194

1. Concrete and Abstract 141–152
a. Concrete the Outward Sign of Abstract 142–144
b. Literal and Figurative Application 144–150
(1) Local Relations 144–146
(2) Causal, Instrumental, and Modal Relations 146–150
c. Corporeal and Incorporeal Attributes 150–152

2. Internal and External 152–161
a. Part of Man and External Object 152–154
(1) Corporeal Part of Man 153
(2) Incorporeal Part of Man 153–154
b. Subjective and Objective 154–161
(1) One Member Made Parallel to the Other by Metonymy 154–157
(2) One Member the Cause of the Other 157–160
(a) Subjective Cause; Objective Result 157–159
(b) Objective Cause; Subjective Result 159–160
(c) Subjective and Objective Terms Interacting 160
(3) Miscellaneous Examples 160–161

3. Permanent and Temporary 161–171
a. Both Members Nouns or Adjectives 161–164
(1) Member Expressing Temporary Relation Attributive 162–163
(2) Member Expressing Temporary Relation Predicative 163–164
b. Member Expressing Permanent Relation a Noun or an Adjective· Member Expressing Temporary Relation a Participle 164–169
(1) Past Participle 164–167
(2) Present Participle 167–169
(3) Future Participle 169
c. Both Members Participles 170
d. Both Members Verbs 170–171
4. State and Action 171–174
a. Member Expressing State an Abstract Noun; Member Expressing Action a Verbal Noun 171–172
b. Member Expressing State an Adjective; Member Expressing Action a Participle 172–173
(1) Present Participle 172
(2) Past Participle of Deponent Verb 172–173
c. Member Expressing State a Past Participle; Member Expressing Action a Present Participle 173–174
5. Causal and Resultant 174–184
a. Process and Result 174–175
b. Cause and Effect 175–179
(1) Examples Involving Adjectives and Participles 175
(2) Examples Involving Verbs 176
(3) Examples Involving Nouns 176–179
c. Primary and Secondary Cause or Means 179–184
(1) Examples Involving Nouns 179–183
(2) Examples Involving Verbs 183–184
6. Fixed and Vague 185–189
a. Definite and Indefinite 185
b. Specific and General 185–188
c. Actual and Contingent 188–189
7. Animate and Inanimate 190–194
a. Person or Persons and Place 190–193
(1) Word for Place a Common Noun 190–192
(2) Word for Place a Proper Noun 192–193
b. Person or Persons and Group 193–194
c. Person or Persons and Arms 194
B. Examples in Which Leading Word in One Member Is in Thought Parallel with Dependent Word in Other Member 195–223
1. Examples Involving Nouns 195–220
a. One Member a Periphrasis 195–214
(1) Place 195
(2) Group of Persons 196
(3) Race 196–197
(4) Appearance or Form 197–199
(5) Part of the Body 200–202

(6) Material 202–203
(7) Quality 204–208
(8) Action 209–214
(a) Result of Action 209–211
(b) Action in Process 211–214
b. One Member of the '*Ab Urbe Condita*' Type 214–220
(1) Passive Participle 215–217
(2) Active Participle 217–218
(3) Adjective 218–220
2. Examples Involving Verbs 221–223
a. Logically Independent Form Made Parallel to Dependent 221–222
(1) Infinitive 221–222
b. Logically Dependent Form Made Parallel to Independent 222–223
(1) Infinitive 222–223
(2) Participle 223
C. Examples Involving Terms not Mutually Exclusive 224–244
1. One Member Includes the Other Logically 224–231
a. The Second Member Includes the First 224–225
(1) Gods 224–225
(2) Persons 225
(3) Places 225
(4) Things 225
b. The First Member Includes the Second 226–231
(1) Gods 226–228
(2) Persons 228–231
(3) Places 231
(4) Things 231
2. One Member Includes the Other Physically 231–244
a. Place and Its Occupant 231–236
(1) Occupant a Thing 231–233
(2) Occupant an Animal 233–234
(3) Occupant a Person 234–236
b. Person and His Accessories 236–237
(1) Arms 236–237
(2) Wearing Apparel 237
c. Person or Animal and Part of His or Its Body 238–242
d. Whole and Part 242–244
e. Man and His Qualities or His Deeds 244
CONCLUSION 245–246
INDEXES 247–264
I. Index Locorum 247–258
A. Passages in Vergil 247–256
B. Passages in Authors Other than Vergil 257–258
II. Index Rerum 259–264
VITA 265

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The scholars cited most often are referred to by initials only, as follows:

C. = John Conington, P. Vergili Maronis Opera, revised by Henry Nettleship; Vol. I, fourth edition*, London, Whittaker and Co., George Bell, 1881; Vol. II, fourth edition, London, Whittaker and Co., George Bell and Sons, 1884; Vol. III, third edition, London, Whittaker and Co., George Bell and Sons, 1883.

F.-B. = H. R. Fairclough and Seldon L. Brown, Virgil's Aeneid, Books I–VI, Boston, Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., no date of publication (date of preface 1908).

G.-L. = B. L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge, Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar, third edition, Boston, D. C. Heath and Co., no date of publication (date of preface 1894).

H. = Fredericus Arturus Hirtzel, P. Vergili Maronis Opera, Oxford, Clarendon Press, no date of publication (date of preface 1900).

K§. = Charles Knapp, The Aeneid of Vergil, Books I–VI, Selections VII–XII, Chicago, Scott, Foresman and Company; first edition, no date of publication (date of preface 1901); revised edition, 1928.

N. = Henry Nettleship. See under C.

P. = T. E. Page, P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica, London, Macmillan and Co., 1918.

Q. V. = Quaestiones Virgilianae, by Philip Wagner, in volume 4, pages 383–600, of Christ. Gottl. Heyne, Publius Virgilius Maro, fourth edition, edited by Ge. Phil. Eberard. Wagner, five volumes, Leipzig, Libraria Hahniana, 1830–1833

In citations from Vergil, the letter E. designates the Eclogues, and the letter G. the Georgics. Where there is no such designation, it is to be understood that the reference is to the Aeneid.

---

*I have availed myself of the fifth edition, revised by F. Haverfield (London, George Bell and Sons, 1898), wherever he departs from the fourth edition in a manner having some bearing on my discussion, but I have regularly used the fourth edition, which I have found far more valuable.

§References are regularly to the revised edition, which, fortunately, appeared just before the last touches were put to this monograph. However, wherever the initial K. alone is used, it may be assumed by the reader that this edition differs in no essential point from the first. Whenever any essential difference exists, reference is made to both editions, and they are designated respectively as K.[1] and K.[2].

INTRODUCTION

The present study developed as part of a larger investigation that had for its object the examination of the phenomenon of fusion or blending as it occurs in Vergil[1]. This is the process that is at the basis of Vergil's well-known "habit of hinting at one mode of expression while actually using another"[2]. It consists of the combination of *two* different possible ways of expressing the same thought, or even of *two* different thoughts, into a single harmonious and highly suggestive *one*; and the attempt to resolve that one into the two that went to make it up is fascinating in the extreme.

Examples of such blending or fusion in Vergil are numerous, as a glance at the list of instances catalogued by Professor Knapp in his Index (in K.[1]) under the caption *Confusion* (537) will readily show. The subject has many ramifications; and, though I set out valiantly to study them all, I was finally forced to content myself, for the present, with but one, the combination of entities that, if viewed from the standpoint of strict logic, cannot be considered as absolutely parallel[3].

Obviously, inexact coordination is a form of fusion, consisting as it does of the combination of two precise collocations, a+b and a′+b′, into a single less precise one, a+b′ or a′+b. Practically every example listed in this monograph could be resolved into its two component elements in accordance with this formula; and such resolution gives us a very clear insight into the manner in which the suggestiveness

[1]By "Vergil" I mean the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid. I am not considering the so-called Appendix Vergiliana, which I hope to treat at some future time.

[2]C. on G. 2.364.

[3]Even this topic is not treated here with the completeness with which I had intended to handle it: my original plan included a discussion of the manner in which, out of the coordination of non-parallels, developed the two special rhetorical devices known as hendiadys and zeugma. The former term I consider a misnomer, for I believe that the two factors present are really two separate entities, not one, even though they do not happen to be two entities precisely on a par. Hendiadys I believe may be summed up in the formula 'facio *a* et *b*', in this case both 'facio *a*' and 'facio *b*' are perfectly logical when considered separately, but the combination '*a* et *b*' does not constitute a perfectly parallel pair. Zeugma may also be summed up by 'facio *a* et *b*', but with this difference, that the members of the pair '*a* et *b*' may be absolutely coordinate, but 'facio *a*' and 'facio *b*' do not strictly correspond with each other: either *facio* will have a different meaning with *a* from what it has with *b*, or it will be utterly meaningless with either *a* or *b*. (The grammarians, e. g. G.-L., §690, Harkness, §751.2, Note, seem to recognize only the second class, but in practice the editors do not distinguish between them.)—An abridged form of my discussion of hendiadys appeared in The Classical Weekly 15.193–197, under the title Hendiadys: Is there Such a Thing? (Based on a Study of Vergil). My discussion of zeugma I hope to publish at some future time. A summary of it I presented orally at a joint session of the American Philological Association and the Linguistic Society of America, held in New York, N. Y., December 27, 1928.

of poetry has been evolved out of the bald logic of prose. For such an expression as a+b′, which causes us to recall at once, at least subconsciously, the two possibilities that went into its make-up, possesses the riches of overtones that the more commonplace a+b or a′+b′ wholly lacks. In the case of Vergil, his exquisite skill in making such blendings is a characteristically conspicuous feature of his poetic art; and a study like the present one is useful, it seems to me, primarily in so far as it brings to us a more vivid realization and a clearer understanding of this special gift of a master of poetic diction[4]. It hardly need be said that my analyses of the finished product are offered only in the light of a study of embryology; and I am well aware that, when they have been made, there survive not even the *disiecti membra poetae*!

The reason for this complete loss of poetry when exact logic enters in is, I think, clear. Vergilian diction, so far as mere vocabulary goes, is not, in itself, particularly poetic[5]. It is far more in the "golden phrase" than in the "lonely word"[6], if by "lonely" we mean 'solitary', 'isolated', that Vergil shows himself so completely "lord of language"[7]. Aristotle seems to distinguish two contributing factors

[4]What C. says (1.17) of the Eclogues applies equally well to the Georgics and to the Aeneid: "A minute analysis of the language . . . is in truth a school of poetical criticism; and though the subtilty and complexity of the images involved may induce a practice of over-refining on the part of the inquirer, yet experience, I think, will show that the danger of giving Virgil credit for more than he had in his mind is far less than would be supposed by an ordinary reader."

[5]It is true that W. R. Hardie, Lectures on Classical Subjects, 191 (London, Macmillan and Co., 1903), tells us that no other poet has "so often or so successfully as Virgil" used "words which have already acquired some poetical value"; but this is a matter of literary association, not of essential poetry in the words themselves.

[6]Practically all the "lonely words" cited in Arthur L. Keith's interesting article, The Lonely Word in Vergil, in The Classical Weekly 14.36–37, gain their charm or force from the context (the only possible exception, I think, is *inremeabilis* in 6.425, cited on 37). Compare C. again (1.14): "It is not necessary that these words, in order to be poetical, should be picturesque in the strict sense of the term; on the contrary, it may suit the poet's object to make a physical image retire into the shade, not advance into prominent light: but the imagination will still be appealed to, whatever may be the avenue of approach—by the effect of perspective, by artful juxtaposition, by musical sound, or perhaps, as we have already seen, by remote intellectual association." It is above all the instances in which the effect is attained by "remote intellectual association" that are under discussion here.

[7]What C. signalizes as a merit apparently impressed Agrippa as a vice, if we may judge by Donatus (= Suetonius), who tells us in his life of Vergil, in a paragraph devoted to Vergilian detractors (44): M. Vipsanius a Maecenate eum suppositum appellabat novae cacozeliae repertorem, non tumidae nec exilis, sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis. Nettleship, in his edition of Ancient Lives of Vergil, 20 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879), refers us for an explanation of *cacozelia* to Quintilian (8.3.56), who is even more severe than Agrippa in his definition thereof, saying: Κακόζηλον, id est mala affectatio, per omne dicendi genus peccat. Nam et tumida et pusilla et praedulcia et abundantia et arcessita et exultantia sub idem nomen cadunt. Denique κακόζηλον vocatur quidquid est

in poetic diction, unusual words[8] and unusual phrases[9]. It is in the use of the latter rather than of the former that Vergil excels. In this he resembles Horace[10], and differs from Sophocles[11]; indeed, a comparative study of the vocabularies of Sophocles and Vergil would, I think, be most interesting and suggestive in the striking difference which I feel sure it would reveal between two poets whose style is in other ways so similar.

This similarity is in no way closer than in that very matter of fusion which is here under consideration. Haigh's comments on Sophocles[12] apply equally well to Vergil, as he is himself aware. He says admirably: "He is a master of those felicitous and artfully chosen phrases, which tantalise the reader by their beauty and suggestiveness, stimulating his curiosity, while they elude exact anal-

---

ultra virtutem, quotiens ingenium iudicio caret et specie boni fallitur, omnium in eloquentia vitiorum pessimum. It should be noted that Agrippa expressly exempts Vergil from some of the harshest of these strictures, by saying that his *cacozelia* is not *tumida* or *exilis* (compare Quintilian's *tumida et pusilla*).

[8]See Poetics 1458a: *σεμνὴ <λέξις> δὲ καὶ ἐξαλλάττουσα τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἡ τοῖς ξενικοῖς κεχρημένη. ξενικὸν δὲ λέγω γλῶτταν καὶ μεταφορὰν καὶ ἐπέκτασιν καὶ πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸ κύριον.* And again 1458b: *διὰ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἄλλως ἔχειν ἡ ὡς τὸ κύριον, παρὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς γιγνόμενον, τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ποιήσει, διὰ δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῦ εἰωθότος τὸ σαφὲς ἔσται.*

[9]See Poetics 1458b–1459a: *ἃ οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴποι ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ τούτοις χρῶνται <οἱ τραγῳδοί>, οἷον τὸ δωμάτων ἄπο ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀπὸ δωμάτων, καὶ τὸ σέθεν καὶ τὸ ἐγὼ δέ νιν καὶ τὸ Ἀχιλλέως πέρι ἀλλὰ μὴ περὶ Ἀχιλλέως, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις ποιεῖ τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ἐν τῇ λέξει ἅπαντα τὰ τοιαῦτα.*

We may compare Hardie (cited in note 5), who seems to be writing especially with Aristotle in mind (187): "We are concerned with what is peculiar to poetry, and at present, in particular, with the ways in which a poet seems sometimes to fuse or recast language. Consider one more example of this.... The example is a thing which perhaps belongs rather specially to Virgil: it consists in making some modification in a common or current phrase, so that it acquires a new significance." It is the unexpectedness that constitutes the especial charm. As W. Warde Fowler says, in Aeneas at the Site of Rome², 42 (Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 1918), "Virgil was not wont to write as one would expect him to".

[10]Compare the introduction to the edition of Horace, Odes and Epodes, by Paul Shorey and Gordon J. Laing, xvii (Boston, Sanborn, 1913), "A study of Horace's style must be mainly an analysis of the art by which he compensates for the slenderness of his own inspiration and the relative poverty of the Latin lyric vocabulary"; and again, xviii, "In considering the means with which he worked, the first thing that strikes us is the simplicity, not to say poverty, of his poetic vocabulary." See also the delightful interchange of articles between Professor Grace Harriet Goodale and Professor Shorey in The Classical Weekly 10.122–126, 173–174, in which the writers cross lances with urbane amity in an end eavor, it seems to me, to prove precisely the same thing.

[11]The difference between the two in this respect is doubtless characteristic not only of the two poets, but of the two languages. Compare Hardie again (193–194): "The Latin language was not naturally suited for poetry in the same way as the Greek. It had great qualities or possibilities—it could be stately, lucid, and forcible—but it had not a similar wealth of graceful and picturesque words; its resources were more limited, it was comparatively stern, narrow, and hard."

[12]A. E. Haigh, The Tragic Drama of the Greeks, 163–164 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896). The passage first came to my notice through Professor Knapp's quotation of it in The Classical Weekly 16.121. The entire article (121–122) of which this quotation is a part is most pertinent to the present discussion.

ysis.... Above all he closely resembles Virgil in the half-veiled allusiveness of his style. He chooses some skilful combination of words, which, beyond its obvious significance, calls to mind yet other combinations, and opens out new vistas of thought. Various fancies and recollections appear to hover round the lines, suggested by the subtlety of the terms employed; and the language, in such cases, becomes alive with meaning, like an atmosphere quivering with diverse-coloured lights."

Through such means as this does Vergil achieve some of his most exquisite effects; and it is undoubtedly for the sake of such effects that he so frequently violates strict logic, as will be duly set forth below.

To be sure, at times it may be that the compelling factor with Vergil is not poetry but the frame of poetry adopted by him—the dactylic hexameter. Of course there are some things that the writer of dactylic hexameters simply cannot do. For instance, he cannot say *arbŏrēs*; he must substitute a different case of the same word, or the same case of a different word; he must, in short, alter either his structure or his vocabulary. There may be many entities, such as the feast of the Sigillaria[13], and Ovid's friend Tuticanus[14], and that illustrious anonymous town referred to by Horace[15], that he cannot call by name. Undoubtedly an interesting study could be made of the effect of the dactylic hexameter upon Latin poetic diction. The influence that it may have exerted over Vergil will be noted occasionally in the course of these pages[16]; and doubtless additional instances will be observed therein where it might have been so noted. But I cannot help feeling that a workman of such consummate skill as Vergil could never have been mastered by his instrument; and I think, if we find in his writings some unusually striking divergence from the normal way of putting things, some other impelling force is to be sought rather than the exigencies of any succession of dactyls and spondees. The "lord of language" reigned supreme not in the sphere of language alone: he was equally the master in another field, as the "wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man".

---

[13]Lucilius, edited by Marx, 228–229. [14]Ovid, Ex Ponto 4.12.1–16.

[15]Horace, Sermones 1.5.87 oppidulo quod versu dicere non est. It is to Edward P. Morris's edition of the Satires (New York, American Book Company, 1909) that I am indebted for the two parallel passages here cited.

[16]E. g., pages 5, 27, notes 24, 25, 102, 118, 896, 921. On the influence of the meter, see further The School Review 13 (1905), 495, note 2, and the references there cited. This note occurs in an article by Charles Knapp, Some Points in the Literary Study of Virgil, 492–508.

PART I

MEMBERS PARALLEL LOGICALLY BUT NOT GRAMMATICALLY

We may note first the coordination of members parallel *logically* but not *grammatically*[17].

A. EXAMPLES INVOLVING THE SAME CLASSES OF WORDS

1. NON-PARALLEL SUBSTANTIVES

a. SUBSTANTIVES DIFFERING IN NUMBER[18]

In the shift from plural to singular in G. 2.65–66 plantis et durae *coryli* nascuntur et ingens *fraxinus*, Vergil may have been influenced to some extent by metrical considerations[19]; but in view of his extremely elaborate characterization of the two kinds of trees next named, the poplar and the oak, designated as *Herculeae. . . arbos umbrosa coronae* and *Chaonii . . . patris glandes*, I am inclined to attribute the variety in number primarily to his desire to avoid, by any and every possible device, the monotony and tediousness so likely to arise in a work such as the Georgics, that must consist in large part of long lists and technical details[20]. With the passage just cited we may compare 6.179–182[21], in which we find two types of trees referred to in the plural, *piceae* and *ornos*, two in the singular, *ilex* and *robur*, and a fifth designated by a phrase, *fraxineae. . . trabes*, that may refer to one tree or to several. Here the meter is doubtless a contributing factor: Vergil could not use *ilices* in the hexameter; and the periphrasis[22] *fraxineae. . . trabes* was a convenient substitute for the difficult *fraxini* (possible only before a vowel) or the impossible *fraxinos*.

Vergil seems to have been influenced mainly by desire for variety in writing G. 3.544–545 interit et. . . *vipera* et. . . *hydri*.

Other examples are 2.219 ⟨serpentes⟩ superant *capite* et *cervicibus* altis, a fusion of *capite et cervice*[23] and *capitibus*[24] *et cervicibus*, and

[17]These members are usually perfect parallels so far as meaning and function go. Thus, since the ablative is essentially an adverbial case, most ablatives may with unassailable logic be coordinated with one another, or even with adverbs. (For the latter type of coordination, see 126–127.)

[18]Probably these first examples show a lack of parallelism in thought at least as much as, if not more than, in form (compare note 31, and contrast note 17); but it seems convenient to group this disparity in number along with the following examples of disparity in case (7–15). This phenomenon seems to play the same part for nouns as is played for verbs by the disparity in tenses cited below, 21–31.

[19]Compare page 4 and note 16. [20]Compare note 358.

[21]Quoted on 19. [22]On this see 203.

[23]The singular is perfectly regular in Latin, as it is in French, of a part of the body which occurs *singly* in each of the various members of a group. We may compare G. 3.272–273 *illae ore* omnes versae in Zephyrum stant. See on this point Raphael Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache[2], revised by Carl Stegmann, 2, §22, Anmerk. 1 (Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1912–1914), where a number of examples are given.

[24]Of course the fact that the form *capitibus* is impossible in the hexameter

7.94–95 *tergo* stratisque . . . *velleribus*, a fusion of *tergo stratoque vellere* and *tergis stratisque velleribus*. There is similar fusion in 2.57 *manus* iuvenem. . . post *terga*[25] revinctum[26]: logic would demand *post tergum*, but the language seems to be influenced by such a mode of expression as we find in 11.81–82 vinxerat et post *terga manus*, quos mitteret umbris inferias.

We may compare also G. 2.201–202 quantum longis carpent armenta *diebus* exigua tantum gelidus ros *nocte* reponet, where *diebus* and *nocte*, while not connected, still balance each other, so that we have a fusion of *diebus* . . . *noctibus* and *die* . . . *nocte*[27]. Possibly Vergil intentionally blended his numbers to stress by suggestion the much greater length of the day-time than of the night-time, and the ease with which, in the brief span of the night, the long day-time destruction is made good[28].

---

would in this particular instance be a decisive factor. But we may compare Horace, Carmina 1.9.23–24 pignusque dereptum *lacertis* aut *digito*, where the poet varies the number without any comparable stress of metrical necessity.

[25]We may compare 9.794–795 neque terga . . . dare . . . patitur and 12.645 terga dabo. Here, besides the metrical convenience, the extreme commonness of the plural form (inasmuch as the flight of a whole body of men is usually mentioned) probably influenced Vergil. Compare G. 4.85 hos . . . dare terga subegit, 9.686 terga dedere, 10.364–365 Arcades . . . vidit . . . dare terga, 12.463 Rutuli dant terga, 12.738 terga dabant . . . Teucri, 6.491 pars <= alii> vertere terga, 8.706 vertebant terga Sabaei. See also below, 201, on G. 4.13 picti squalentia terga lacerti.

I may add here, *si parva licet componere magnis*, an English example from Theodore Tilton's doggerel The Fly, 40–44: "Tongues to talk have you and I: God has given the little *fly* No such *things*; So he sings With his buzzing wings." Here the versifier is absolutely at the mercy of his rhyme scheme; but the inaccuracy of expression which this necessitates is somewhat veiled by several circumstances. (1) The perfectly appropriate use of the plural *tongues* with the earlier phrase *you and I* softens the absurd use of the plural *things* to refer to the same member with respect to the *fly*. The principle at work here is very similar to that which renders fairly natural Vergil's employment of *terga* of an individual, because he so frequently has occasion to use this term of a group, as pointed out in the preceding paragraph of this note. (2) Again, the perfectly appropriate use of the plural *wings* to refer to a pair of members possessed by the individual fly also softens the use of a plural term to refer to a member which, when present at all, occurs singly. In the same way, Vergil, in writing 2.57, may have been subconsciously led by the accurate plural *manus* to set beside it the inaccurate plural *terga*. See again on this note 896. (3) In the stanza here quoted, *the little fly*, unlike the phrase *a fly* in the opening stanza, really stands generically for all flies. In the same way the collective singular *nocte* in the next example discussed, G. 2.201–202, really represents the plural *noctibus*, as is pointed out in note 27.

[26]This and the following example, G. 2.201–202, seem so pertinent that they are included here, though, strictly speaking, we must observe that they do not belong here, since there is no question of faulty coordination. Compare note 18.

[27]Of course *nocte*, especially as it comes after the plural *diebus*, must be regarded as a collective. But it is not a perfect parallel for a plural, none the less.

[28]If the literal meaning of the passage were pushed, the same idea would be brought out still more strongly; and, while we are of course not supposed to infer that *one* night repairs the damage of *many* days, still the fact that that is what Vergil actually says, must add to the impression created.

10.168–169 quis tela ⟨sunt⟩ *sagittae gorytique* leves umeris et letifer *arcus* is simpler and less interesting.

Perhaps we may compare likewise the correlation of the plural *alii* and the collective singular *pars*[29], found in E. 1.64–65 nos hinc *alii*. . . ibimus Afros, *pars* Scythiam, etc.[30]

b. SUBSTANTIVES DIFFERING IN CASE USAGE

(1) Substantives in the Same Case Used in Different Ways[31]

In English, collocations of substantives used in the same case but in different ways usually produce a supposedly humorous effect, as 'He came on time and on horse-back', 'She sewed with pains and a needle'[32]. This effect is perhaps in part due to our use of the preposition, which is employed in a manner bordering on zeugma.

In 2.179 quod *pelago* et curvis secum avexere *carinis*, *pelago* is the ablative of the way by which, *carinis* the ablative of place or means[33]; but the two are fairly parallel in that each involves a blending of the

[29]Compare note 27.

[30]The oddest confusion of numbers that I know of is so interesting that, though logically it does not belong here (compare note 26), I cannot forbear to mention it in passing. This is 4.262–264 ensis erat Tyrioque ardebat murice *laena*. . ., dives *quae munera* Dido fecerat, et tenui telas discreverat auro, where *quae munera* gets its number from *ensis*. . . *-que*. . . *laena*, though logically the verb of which it is the object refers only to *laena*.

We may note also a group of examples showing a confusion of numbers of a different sort, namely 1.140 *vestras*, *Eure*, domos, 9.525 *vos*, o *Calliope*, precor, *aspirate* canenti, 10.188 crimen, *Amor*, *vestrum*. The inconcinnity here is occasioned by the circumstance that Eurus is regarded as standing for all the winds, Calliope as standing for all the muses, and Amor (according to N.) as standing for Cupid and his mother.

[31]Many of the examples cited below (141–152) of the union of a concrete and an abstract might with equal justice have been grouped here (compare notes 18 and 592). Observe especially the discussion on 147–150.

[32]Compare below, 141 and note 594.

[33]The instrumental idea doubtless predominates, but it seems to me that the local idea is also present. We may compare the ablatives in 1.40 summergere *ponto*, 1.52–54 hic vasto rex Aeolus *antro*. . . ventos. . . imperio premit, 1.60 *speluncis* abdidit atris, in regard to which editors differ. F.-B. call the ablatives in 1.52 and 1.60 local. K. in his note on *antro* in 1.52, with which he compares *ponto* in 1.40, says that the ablative may be either local or instrumental, and he refers again to this note in his comment on *speluncis* in 1.60. However, in his Introduction, § 142 in K.[1], § 155 in K.[2], he shows that he prefers to regard the ablatives in 1.40 and 1.60 as instrumental, and *antro* in 1.52–54 as local. The presence in the last-mentioned passage of a second ablative, *imperio*, which is indubitably instrumental, seems to me to make the classification of *antro* as local almost obligatory (compare note 44). Otherwise I should consider *antro* hardly different in use from *ponto* or *speluncis*, both of which I think could safely be classified as expressing either a local or an instrumental relationship, or as combining the two notions.

For a similar blend of instrumental and modal ideas, see C's. note on *fato* in 1.2 (which might also be called causal, as it actually is by K.[1], though K.[2] takes it as instrumental). On the shading off of the instrumental idea into that of specification, see below, note 621. Compare further note 44, on a group of ablatives that are particularly hard to classify; and notes 500 and 522, on the in-

local and the instrumental[34]. As C. points out, either *pelago vehere* or *carinis vehere* might stand alone[35]; it is the fusion of the two that seems not absolutely precise. Wagner's note (in Q. V. 34.2) is interesting: "si omitteretur copula, nescio quid ingratum habitura haec erant: pelago curvis secum avexere carinis: quum *pelago avehere*, et *carinis avehere* idem significent[36]."

We have contrast, though not correlation, of nouns not quite parallel, in 1.209 spem *vultu* simulat, premit altum *corde* dolorem, where, as K. says, the ablative of means *vultu* (which may have a shade of local force) and the ablative of place *corde* (which may have a shade of instrumental force) balance each other in the sense of 'openly' and 'inwardly'.

11.677–678 Ornytus[37] *armis* ignotis et *equo* venator Iapyge fertur[38] is harder. K., while regarding the two ablatives here as quite different, still thinks that "they both express the manner of Ornytus's movement". I find it hard to see how this applies to *armis ignotis*, which, if it modifies the verb at all, would seem to do so in the loose

---

definiteness of the boundary between the ablative absolute and other ablatives.

For other instances of expressions hard to classify with certainty, compare, in addition to the notes already referred to, notes 446 and 978.

The blending of ablatives in general (referred to again in note 477) is treated by Charles E. Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin, Volume II, The Cases, 279–280 (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1914). Compare what the same authority has to say of unclassifiable genitives, 11–12, 37–38, 70–80; and Professor Knapp's comment thereon (277) in his review of Bennett's work, Studies in the Syntax of Early Latin, A. J. P. 35 (1914), 268–293. On the genitive, see further note 944; and on the dative, note 402. We may note also what Professor Knapp has written in The Classical Weekly 10.210: "I say, with no sense of shame at all, that there are many case-constructions, particularly of the genitive and of the ablative, which I do not find it easy, to put the matter mildly, to enter under any one of the recognized categories." Professor Knapp has supplemented this note by pointing out to me that the current classification of cases as of moods is modern: no hint of such classification in ancient days is given in the elaborate index to Keil, Grammatici Latini.

I may add an experience of my own, if such be needed, as evidence of the fact that those using their native language are frequently wholly ignorant not only of the need for, but even of the existence of, many an elaborate distinction laid down by the systematic grammarian for the guidance of foreigners. A Swiss friend of mine, educated in Switzerland and now engaged in teaching English in a secondary school there, regaled me with a most elaborate and complicated series of rules concerning the use of the past and the present perfect tenses in English—a common stumbling-block to foreigners. These rules, which he had been taught as a boy and was now teaching in his turn, were wholly undreamed of in my philosophy!

[34]Compare notes 17 and 33.

[35]On this compare note 181, end of the second paragraph, on G. 1.203 illum . . . rapit alveus.

[36]But this is not strictly true, since, as Professor Knapp has pointed out to me, the ancients did at times *carinis avehere* on land (e. g. across the Isthmus of Corinth); nor does Wagner take any cognizance of lake and river transportation.

[37]N. prints *Ornitus*.

[38]Compare 9.269–270 quo Turnus equo, quibus ibat in armis aureus, on which see below, 16.

and vague manner of that ablative designated, for lack of a better term, 'ablative of attendant circumstance'. The phrase appears to me rather an ablative of quality, to be joined with *Ornytus. . .venator*[39]; but to combine in this fashion an adjectival and an adverbial modifier[40] is doubly anomalous. It might simplify matters to take both ablatives as descriptive[41]—'Ornytus, a hunter with strange arms and an Iapygian horse'—, in which case the parallelism is irreproachable; yet *equo. . .Iapyge* certainly seems to belong to the verb rather than to the substantive. We could keep *equo. . .Iapyge* with the verb, and yet combine *armis ignotis* with the substantive[42], if we chose to regard *et* as connecting the ablative *armis ignotis* and the nominative *venator*[43], the sense being 'Ornytus, strangely accoutered and a hunter'; but this seems strained and harsh. Moreover, the word-order is decidedly against the view that the member introduced by *et* is *venator* rather than *equo*, unless we join *equo. . .Iapyge* with *venator*; and if we do that, we are confronted by the same difficulty, that *equo . . . Iapyge* certainly seems to belong with *fertur* rather than with *venator*.

3.414 haec loca *vi*. . . et vasta convulsa *ruina* gives us a combination of an ablative of means with an ablative of manner. Perhaps G. 3.220–221 alternantes multa *vi* proelia miscent *vulneribus* crebris is similar, but there the absence of a copulative indicates that the ablatives are to be assigned to different words, probably *vi* to *alternantes* and *vulneribus* to *proelia miscent*[44].

In 7.216–217 *consilio. . .animis*que volentibus. . .adferimur, *consilio* seems to me to express means, and *animis . . . volentibus*, manner.

[39]Or simply with *Ornytus* directly, as the order suggests. The use of an ablative modifying a proper noun, without the insertion of such a word as *homo* or *vir*, would not, I think, be an irrefutable objection. Instances of such use are rare, according to Lane, §1044. In G.-L., §365, R. 1, we find a similar statement with respect to the genitive of quality (the authors seem not to mention the corresponding usage with the ablative). However, some instances undoubtedly occur. Compare Cicero, In Catilinam 1.4 interfectus est. . .C. Gracchus, clarissimo patre, avo, maioribus; and other examples from Cicero cited for both genitive and ablative—the latter said to be more common—by Jules Lebreton, Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron, 83–84 (Paris, Hachette, 1901). On such use of the genitive of quality, see further Ernst Wilhelm Fabri's note on Livy 21.1.4 (in his edition of Books 21–22, revised by Heinrich Wilhelm Heerwagen, Nuremberg, 1852), John E. B. Mayor's note on Pliny, Epistulae 3.5.8 (in his edition of Book 3, London, Macmillan and Co., 1889), and J. D. Duff's note on Juvenal 3.48 (in his edition of the Satires, Cambridge, University Press, 1898). References for both genitive and ablative are given (page 398) in Stolz-Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik[5] (revised by Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munich, 1928).

[40]Compare 121 on 6.640–641, and note 487.

[41]Or they might possibly be regarded as instrumental if the verbal idea in *venator* is stressed. Then the idea would be 'a man who hunts with strange arms and an Iapygian horse'. [42]*Ornytus* alone. Compare note 39.

[43]This example would then belong with those cited below, 10–15.

[44]The piling up of non-parallel substantives without a connective is odder in Vergil than their copulation. (Compare the rarity of several unconnected epi-

(2) Substantives in Different Cases[45]

4.35–36 aegram nulli quondam flexere mariti, non *Libyae*, non ante *Tyro* is to be classed as an example of the combination of two substantives in different cases. There is no copulative, but the two nouns, one in the locative case and the other in the ablative, are used as if parallel[46], as of course they are in thought, since both represent place

---

thets with the same noun: see e. g. notes 686 and 718. See also note 468, on the combination without a connective of two modifiers of the same noun, one an adjective and the other an ablative.) A passage such as 1.715 *complexu* Aeneae *collo*que pependit represents the norm in Vergil, even though the two nouns connected by *-que* are by no means perfect parallels (on their lack of parallelism, see 146). With this we may contrast the much less regular form found in a passage of rather similar meaning, 8.387–388 *lacertis* cunctantem *amplexu* molli fovet. Other examples of the piling up of ablatives are G. 3.439 (=2.475) *linguis* micat *ore* trisulcis, 8.219–220 Alcidae *furiis* exarserat atro *felle* dolor, and 1.52–54 hic vasto rex Aeolus *antro* luctantis ventos tempestatesque sonoras *imperio* premit ac vinclis et carcere frenat. In this last passage, the wide separation of the ablatives makes their piling up less conspicuous. The other three passages illustrating this phenomenon are harsher; and, as it happens, all their ablatives are rather hard to classify (compare note 33). C. decides that, in the first, *lacertis* is instrumental, *amplexu* perhaps modal; in the second, *ore* may be local, *linguis* instrumental or modal; in the third, *felle* is probably attributive, *furiis* causal or modal. With respect to *lacertis* and *amplexu*, C. seems to me perfectly correct, though if these words, like *complexu* and *collo* in 1.715, had been joined by *-que*, I should not hesitate to assign the same construction to both. Compare the similar comment, in the first paragraph of note 33, on the ablatives in 1.52–54. Professor Knapp's explanation of *ore* (made privately to me) as an ablative of source, seems to me far more satisfactory than C's. I would call *felle*, rather than either *linguis* or *furiis*, modal. Professor Knapp suggests to me that *felle* may be ablative of route, as may also be *lacrimis* in 2.651 nos . . . effusi lacrimis, though in his edition he classes the latter as a dative, =*in lacrimas*. C. calls *lacrimis* an ablative of specification, as *felle* might also be called. Far simpler than any of the foregoing examples is 9.153 *luce* palam certum est *igni* circumdare muros. Here the instrumental ablative *igni* is very closely combined in thought with the verb *circumdare*, while the temporal ablative *luce* modifies the entire phrase *igni circumdare* (compare the similar remark on page 169 concerning the corresponding use of adjectives).

[45]Wagner (Q. V. 34.2) would class here 11.569 *pastorum* et solis exegit *montibus* aevum, for he believes that *et* couples the genitive *pastorum* and the ablative *solis*. . . *montibus*, both of which he regards as modifiers of *aevum*. But his paraphrase (which, incidentally, omits *montibus*), *pastoralem et solitariam ... vitam*, seems to me to render this idea much better than does Vergil's line. I must doubt with C. whether *pastorum* could be used thus with *aevum*, even though Servius so takes it; *pastoris* would be more logical (not that that matters!), but this too seems to me un-Latin. And I must also doubt whether the locative ablative *solis*. . . *montibus* could be used with *aevum*. I should rather take *pastorum* with *montibus*, as does C. (though realizing, as C. does, that, as its position shows, "it is meant rhetorically to colour the whole verse"), and *solis*. . . *montibus* with *exegit*. As for *et*, I cannot follow Wagner's argument that rather than use *et* to connect this line with the preceding one, Vergil would have omitted the conjunction altogether; it appears to me quite logical, not in the sense of 'but', which is the only one that Wagner recognizes, but in that of 'and so', as C. says.

[46]The repetition of *non* virtually replaces a coordinate conjunction. See C. on E. 4.6. Examples of such 'connective repetition'—to coin a phrase—are common in Horace also. Compare Epistulae 1.7.27–28 *reddes* dulce loqui, *reddes* ridere decorum *et* inter vina fugam Cinarae maerere protervae, where the second *reddes* serves just as truly to unite *loqui* and *ridere* as *et* does to unite *ridere* and *maerere*; also *ib.* 79 *dum* requiem, *dum* risus undique quaerit.

where[47]. We should rather have expected to find the cases reversed, with the name of the country in the ablative[48], that of the city in the locative; but part of the poet's art lies in breaking away from the normal prose form and giving us what we do not expect[49].

In G. 2.101 *dis* et *mensis* accepta secundis, we have a dative and an ablative of time[50]. Either alone with *accepta* is, of course, unimpeachable.

In G. 1.429 *agricolis pelago*que parabitur imber, *agricolis* is surely a dative of reference; *pelago* may be the same, or it may be an ablative of place. The phrase is a poetical variety, as C. puts it, for *agris pelagoque* (ablative) or *agricolis nautisque* (dative); in other words, it results from a fusion of the two[51].

I would class here also 4.102–103 *communem* hunc ergo *populum paribus*que regamus *auspiciis*. Both C. and K.[1] seem to couple *paribus. . .auspiciis* simply with *communem*, C. explaining that *communem* is used in the predicate, K.[1] that it = *communi imperio*; and if that is correct, this example belongs in a later section[52]. However, I feel that we gain better balance by joining the whole phrases, each consisting of a noun and a limiting adjective: 'let us rule a common people, *and* (let us rule) with joint auspices', or (to bring out the predicate idea) 'let us rule a people in common, *and* (let us rule) with auspices joint'[53]. I am pleased to note that in his Revised Edition, K. expresses a very similar view.

There is a similar balance, obtained by the use of predicate nouns instead of predicate adjectives, in 3.329 *me famulo famulam*que

[47]Servius suggests that *Tyro* may be ablative of place whence; but, in view of the sense, that seems to me utterly out of the question.

[48]According to C., the first reading of Pal. really is *Libya*—a variant mentioned by Servius also. [49]Compare note 9.

[50]If *mensis* is, as it may be, a dative, we have parallelism in case, but a greater shift in view-point, since *mensis*, unlike *dis*, does not indicate the recipient. In translating, we should need to use 'to' in rendering *dis*, 'for' in rendering *mensis*. C., to be sure, in his Translation uses 'to' twice over—"welcome to the gods and to the banquet's second course"—, but the effect, on my ears, at least, is unnatural.

[51]A similar fusion of imagery—without, however, any grammatical non-parallelism—occurs in G. 1.208 *die somni*que . . . horas, where we should expect either *die noctisque* or *laboris somnique*. *Die* is undoubtedly a genitive here. Of course if we accept the reading *dies*, which we learn from Gellius (9.14.7, cited by C.) was found in a copy reputed to be Vergil's own, and if we follow Wagner in interpreting this, not as the genitive which Gellius took it to be (he paraphrased it by *diei*), but as the accusative plural, we must regard the word as coordinate not with *somni* but with (*somni*) *horas*. In that case the lack of parallelism is still more striking.

[52]Pages 113–125, especially 119–124.

[53]For the shift from transitive to intransitive use of the verb, compare the reverse shift in E. 3.72 (see 15); and for the emphasis on the adjective, compare G. 4.153–154 solae *communis* natos, *consortia* tecta urbis habent (see Haverfield's note, in which he takes issue—justly, I think—with C's. view of the passage).

Heleno transmisit habendam. K. says, "Andromache describes the one act of Pyrrhus in terms more properly suited to an account of two acts." She seems to say, 'He handed me to a slave, and he handed a slave to Helenus', thus implying the degradation cast on both herself (because of the nature of the recipient) and Helenus (because of the nature of the gift). Or we may interpret more simply, as do Wagner and C., 'He handed me *to* a slave and *as* a slave—to Helenus', in which case Andromache is emphasizing the double degradation to herself, not only a slave, but a slave given to a slave—probably a stronger interpretation, and one implying truer psychology on Vergil's part. In either case the repetition of the same root—*famulo famulam* —is extremely striking[54], and is doubtless made more so by the use of *-que*.

10.734–735 *obvius adverso*que occurrit seque viro vir contulit gives an example of the copulation of two adjectives in different cases, which is so closely parallel to the copulation of substantives just

[54]We may compare, for the repetition of the noun in a different case, 10.600 *fratrem* ne desere *frater* (10.338–339 huic *frater* subit Alcanor *fratrem*que ruentem sustentat is very similar), 12.289 *regem regis*que insigne gerentem (on this see again page 168 and note 155), 1.684 *pueri puer* indue vultus, 5.569 Atys *puero* . . . *puer* dilectus Iulo (on this see again 114), 11.632 legitque *virum vir*, 10.734–735 seque *viro vir* contulit, 10.361 haeret *pede pes* densusque *viro vir*, 10.751 <obtruncat> hunc *peditem pedes* (if we accept C's. punctuation; see his note), 12.748 trepidique *pedem pede* fervidus urget, 5.324 *calcem*que terit iam *calce*, 11.615 *pectora pectoribus* rumpunt (see also the examples of a somewhat different type treated in note 155). Two very similar passages involving the use of adjectives (compare note 55) are 4.83 illum *absens absentem* auditque videtque and 10.375–376 *mortali* urgemur ab hoste *mortales*. We find, too, a number of examples involving the use of different cases of the same adjective in two different phrases or clauses (corresponding to the use of *frater* . . . *fratrem* in 10.338–339, cited just above): 11.642–643 Herminium, *nudo* cui vertice fulva caesaries *nudi*que umeri (see 83 and note 687), G. 2.327 *magnus* alit, *magno* commixtus corpore, fetus (see note 700), 10.842 = 12.640 *ingentem* atque *ingenti* vulnere victum (see 165–166); very similar to these is 10.329–330 *septem* numero, *septena*que tela coniciunt (see 130–131 and note 700). Different degrees of comparison of the same adjective are used in 11.124 o fama *ingens*, *ingentior* armis (see 149 and 158) and E. 5.44 *formosi* pecoris custos, *formosior* ipse (see note 530). A similar combination of adjective and adverb occurs in 5.447–448 ipse *gravis graviter*que . . . concidit (see 128 and note 700).

Parallels from other authors abound. Particularly striking are those in which, as in Vergil 10.600, the element of mutual relationship is stressed: such are Thucydides 7.44.7 *ξυμπεσόντες* . . . *φίλοι τε φίλοις καὶ πολῖται πολίταις*, Plato, Menexenes 247 C *φίλοι παρὰ φίλους ἡμᾶς ἀφίξεσθε*, Sophocles, Antigone 73 *φίλη μετ' αὐτοῦ κείσομαι, φίλου μέτα*, Sulpicia 1.10 (=Tibullus 3.13.10 or 4.7.10) *digno digna* fuisse ferar, Ovid, Ex Ponto 4.12.22 non mihi quam *fratri frater* amate minus (compare Vergil 10.600). Other instances involving substantives and adjectives are Homer, Iliad 13.131 *ἀσπὶς ἀρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ'ἀνήρ* (compare Vergil 11.632, 10.734–735, 10.361), Tyrtaeus 9.31–33 (Hiller-Crusius) *καὶ πόδα παρ ποδὶ θεὶς καὶ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος ἀσπίδ' ἐρείσας, ἐν δὲ λόφον τε λόφῳ καὶ κυνέην κυνέῃ καὶ στέρνον στέρνῳ πεπλημένος ἀνδρὶ μαχέσθω*, Archilochus 69 (Hiller-Crusius) *καὶ πεσεῖν δρήστην ἐπ' ἀσκὸν κάπι γαστρὶ γαστέρα προσβαλεῖν μηρούς τε μηροῖς* (this last sounds like a burlesque variation of the type of expression illustrated by the two preceding ones; with all three compare Vergil 10.361, 12.748, 5.324, 11.615), Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound 193–194

treated that it may as well be cited here[55]. The balance attained is very like that of *famulo famulam*que, inasmuch as *obvius* and *adverso* are practically synonymous; but, since *obvius* suggests *obvio* and *adverso* suggests *adversus*, the repetition of precisely the same word would in this instance have been a source of weakness rather than of strength. Either *obvius occurrit*, or *adverso occurrit*, alone, would have given us the same picture, completely, but not nearly so vividly. We might also have had *obvius adverso occurrit*[56], corresponding perfectly to *viro vir contulit* in the next clause; but here as in the preceding example, *-que* adds vigor, in this case serving to intensify the idea of opposition and conflict.

Similarly, different cases of the same relative or interrogative[57] pronoun or adjective[58] may be coupled, without regard to strict grammar.

An example is E. 3.8–9 novimus et *qui* te . . . et *quo* . . . *sacello*. Of course as subject of the verb that is understood with *quo* (*sacello*), we cannot use *qui*, but must supply *ille*[59]. Since this *ille* would naturally be omitted in any case, and since either *qui te* (*corruperit*) or *quo*

ἐμοὶ . . . σπεύδων σπεύδοντί ποθ' ἥξει, 220 *ἐκόνθ' ἑκόντι Ζηνὶ συμπαραστατεῖν*, 670–671 *ἐξήλασέν με κἀπέκλησε δομάτων ἄκουσαν ἄκων*, Sophocles, Oedipus at Colonus 1258–1259 *ὁ δυσφιλὴς γέρων γέροντι συγκατῴκηκεν πίνος*, Euripides, Iphigenia in Tauris 31 *ἀνάσσει βαρβάροισι βάρβαρος*, Medea 513 *σὺν τέκνοις μόνη μόνοις* (the accuracy of this form of expression may be questioned), Ovid, Ex Ponto 4.12.20 paene mihi *puero* cognito paene *puer* (compare Vergil 5.569, also the other example from the same passage of Ovid, Ex Ponto 4.12.22, cited just above), Plautus, Amphitruo 833–834 mi . . . nemo *corpus corpore* contigit, Seneca, Agamemnon 497–498 *prora prorae* nocuit et *lateri latus* (compare Vergil 10.361, 12.748, 5.324), Lucretius 1.741 graviter *magni magno* cecidere ibi casu (compare for the form Vergil G. 2.327 and 10.842 = 12.640, and for the thought Vergil 5.447–448), Carlyle, The French Revolution 1.5.4 alive they shall not take him, not they *alive* him *alive* (which, like so much of Carlyle, is more rhetorical than logical; compare Euripides, Medea 513). Examples illustrating the same usage as Vergil 5.447–448, that is, the combination of an adjective and an adverb, abound in Greek. We may observe Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound 955 *νέον νέοι κρατεῖτε*, and Euripides, Medea 805–806 *κακὴν κακῶς θανεῖν σφ' ἀνάγκη*; for further instances from the dramatic poets, see the note on the latter passage by J. R. Major in his edition of the Medea (London, Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858, second edition). An English parallel is found in Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, Act 3, Scene 2, If it were so, it was a *grievous* fault, And *grievously* hath Caesar answer'd it.

[55]Compare note 592. It may be observed that ancient grammarians make little or no distinction between nouns and adjectives. For instance, Aristotle in his Poetics does not, apparently, differentiate them; he seems to class them both under the name of *ὄνομα* (see Poetics 1456 b and 1457 a).

[56]Compare Ovid, Metamorphoses 1.528 *obvia*que *adversas* vibrabant flamina vestes.

[57]In the case of interrogatives, the omission of the conjunction would give us a construction which, though vastly less effective, might be more regular. For the combination of interrogatives in a single clause that would be the result, see G.-L., § 470 R. This is the phenomenon that is so common in Greek: see William W. Goodwin, A Greek Grammar[3], §1601 (Ginn & Company, Boston, 1892).

[58]For convenience, adjectives are included here as well as substantives. Compare 12–13 (on 10.734–735) and note 55.

[59]Compare 12.634–636, discussed below, note 61, fifth paragraph.

sacello te (*corruperit*) might stand alone, the irregularity is less noticeable in the Latin than it is in a literal translation. In English, we cannot say, '*who*, and in *what* grotto, corrupted you', though we might soften the harshness by putting it as follows, 'who corrupted you, and in what grotto', *he did so* being understood[60].

Very similar is 10.670 quo feror? unde abii? *quae* me fuga *quem*ve reducit?—a fusion of *quae me fuga reducit?* and *quem* (*haec fuga*) (*me*)[61] *reducit?*

---

[60]Compare below, 48.

[61]I am not sure, however, that it is necessary to supply *me*, although both N. and K. do, interpreting *quem* as *qualem*, and although, I must admit, the presence in the same line of two verbs in the first person as well as the pronoun *me* decidedly favors their view. Yet may not the question be more informal than that?—'What flight is carrying me away—or *whom* is it carrying?' On seeing what is happening to the supposed Aeneas, poor Turnus feels confused like one in a dream, as well he may (compare 10.642 quae sopitos deludunt somnia sensus), and for the moment is led to doubt his own identity, even as—to take some humbler examples—Sosia and Amphitruo in the Amphitruo of Plautus when confronted by their divine doubles (455–457, 844), or the immortal Alice when she "opened out like a telescope" (Lewis Carroll, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, chapter 2), or the old woman in the nursery story, when she was led to pronounce the famous dictum, "Lawk-a-mercy, this is never I!" If this interpretation be correct, the non-parallelism is still more striking, being even sufficiently strong, perhaps, to justify the term anacoluthon.

We may cite as a parallel 6.532–533 pelagine venis erroribus actus an monitu divum? an quae te fortuna fatigat . . .? Here the idea is, I think, 'Do you come here in the course of your uncertain wanderings over the sea, or by the direction of the gods, or—in short, *what* is the fortune that drives you here?' (A parallel occurs in Euripides, Iphigenia in Tauris 511 *φυγὰς δ' ἀπῆρας πατρίδος, ἢ ποίᾳ τύχῃ;*) The inclusion of the final vague possibility after the more specific suggestions that precede it creates the impression that any marvel is possible. The same effect is created through the use of statements instead of questions in 2.45–48 aut hoc inclusi ligno occultantur Achivi, aut haec in nostros fabricata est machina muros. . ., aut aliquis latet error. Here the final *aliquis. . .error* seems to convey the idea 'in short, some trick or other, of whatever sort', though doubtless in this instance logic would demand our supplying *alius* with *error*, as K.[2] does. Similarly, in 6.532–533 it is possible to supply *alia* with *quae. . .fortuna*, as Wagner does. But here strict logic would require not so much *quae alia fortuna*, but rather *aliane fortuna* or *quae fortuna, si alia fortuna* (ablative) *venis*. This last is not unlike the explanation (pronounced intolerably harsh by C.) given by Burmann and Heyne, who would supply *fortuna venis* and take *quae* as a relative. That it may be neither interrogative nor relative, but indefinite, is another possibility, which C. himself tends to approve, on the basis of two passages, Plautus, Asinaria 717, and Terence, Adelphoe 468, in which the indefinite *quid* follows *an*. (However, it must be noted that the reading in the passage from Terence is not certain. Some editors, e. g. Tyrrell, editor of the older Oxford Classical Text, print *quicquam*.) If *quae* is indefinite, it is assuredly necessary to supply *alia*. The omission of this word is natural enough, in accordance with the common lack of precision in such matters (compare 224–231), and the result is certainly superior in logic to my interpretation, but seems to me inferior in force. And between logic and force, we know which Vergil would probably have chosen.

A parallel in English is found in John Galsworthy, The Forsyte Saga, 264 (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925), ". . .was he going to leave London at once, and live in the country, or what was he going to do?"

The method of interpretation advocated in this note for 10.670 and 6.532–533 may also be applied to 1.8–9 and 5.28–29. See note 498 for the one, and note 582 for the other.

We may compare further E. 3.72 o *quotiens* et *quae* nobis Galatea locuta est! In this case the first pronoun is replaced by an adverb[62] (but there is no essential difference between an adverbial ablative phrase like *quo sacello* and an adverb like *quotiens*[63]). The irregularity here is far less marked, inasmuch as the subject remains the same: *Galatea* (like *nobis*) belongs with both *quotiens*(*locuta est*)and *quae . . . locuta est*. The shift here is in the verb, which in the first clause is intransitive ('to speak') and in the second is transitive ('to say')[64], so that this example might be classed as an instance of zeugma.

(3) Substantives with and without Prepositions

(a) Both Substantives in the Ablative

In 5.220–221 *in*[65] *scopulo* luctantem deserit alto Sergestum brevibusque *vadis*, the noun *vadis* may be viewed as parallel to the phrase *in scopulo*. It is, however, quite possible that *in* is to be supplied with *vadis*, although this would produce a zeugma (at least from

---

A little like the suggestion here offered in regard to 6.532–533 is that advanced by K. in regard to 12.634–636 sed quis Olympo demissam tantos voluit te ferre labores? an fratris miseri letum ut crudele videres? He would expand these lines thus: sed quis . . . labores? an tantos voluit te ferre labores ut fratris . . . videres? (or simply, he tells me, an te demisit ut . . . videres?). This is in reverse order as compared with 6.532–533. Here the identity of the agent is questioned first, and the correctness of the speaker's assumption as to the motive of the agent is questioned second, whereas there the first question dealt with means, and the second with the identity of the directing cause. In 12.634–636 there is not exactly an anacoluthon, but there is a slight inconcinnity in the dropping of the interrogative, like that pointed out in E. 3.8–9 (pages 13–14).

The phraseology is rather similar in 9.399–401 quid faciat? qua vi iuvenem, quibus audeat armis eripere? an sese medios moriturus in ensis inferat et pulchram properet per vulnera mortem?, where the interrogatives of the first two clauses have no parallel in the last. But this passage is less complicated than the others. Reduced to its simplest terms, it runs thus: 'What shall he do? By what force or arms shall he dare to rescue the youth? Or shall he die?' And that is merely a rhetorical way of saying, 'What shall he do? Shall he try to rescue the youth by force and arms? Or shall he die?' 'Shall he try to rescue the youth by force and arms?' becomes 'By what force and arms shall he dare to rescue the youth?' because of his realization of the impossibility of success in the undertaking.

[62]A perfect parallel in English is from Alexander Woollcott's Two Gentlemen and a Lady, 75 (New York, Coward-McCann, 1928): "She ate *what* and *when* he ate." Livy 5.45.3 *quae* aut *unde* vis esset ignaros is similar: here the predicate adjective *quae* corresponds to the object pronoun *quae* in E. 3.72. This is an instance not of an adjective used in an adverbial sense (compare pages 127–129), but of an adverb used in an adjectival sense (compare note 520), inasmuch as *unde* stands virtually for *unde orta*—unless we regard *unde. . .esset* as equivalent to *unde. . .veniret*. In that case there is here, as in E. 3.72, a shift in the meaning of the verb.

[63]For this reason it seems convenient to treat the example here rather than in the section (126–127) devoted to the combination of substantives and adverbs. Compare note 520.

[64]Compare what was said of 4.102–103, page 11 and note 53.

[65]The word *in* is omitted by Med., which, according to C., may be right.

the English point of view[66]), since *in* would be equivalent first to 'on' and then to 'in'[67].

In 5.448–449 cava concidit aut *Erymantho* aut *Ida in* magna radicibus eruta pinus, it would be more difficult to understand a second *in*, since the one that is present occurs with the second, not the first, member[68]. However, the lack of parallelism is not very noticeable, because the preposition follows both nouns.

The same question arises in connection with 6.416 informi *limo* glaucaque exponit *in ulva*, where the close parallelism between the phrases *informi limo* and *glauca . . . ulva* certainly would seem to favor the taking of *in* with both; and again in connection with 8.588 *chlamyde* et pictis conspectus in *armis*.

On the other hand, in 9.269–270 vidisti, *quo* Turnus *equo*, *quibus*[69] ibat *in armis* aureus, the sense utterly precludes the supplying of *in* with the first ablative[70].

Again in G. 2.63–64 sed *truncis* oleae melius, *propagine* vites respondent, solido Paphiae *de robore* myrtus, it would be practically impossible to supply *de* with *truncis* and *propagine*, which correspond in thought with the phrase *solido . . . de robore*. Here it is not the sense that interferes, but the extreme harshness that would result if we supplied a preposition from a phrase made remote by the intervention of a separate subject. C. is doubtless right, then, in classing *truncis* and *propagine* as instrumental. Indeed, this would appear to be the natural construction with *respondent*: *solido . . . de robore* seems to demand some more concrete verb, such as *surgunt*.

[66]Just how definitely, if at all, the Romans distinguished the various shades of meaning of the preposition, must remain doubtful (compare note 33). But it certainly seems as if they must have been aware of them. Thus if we were to say in English, 'We keep house *in* the city and *in* the winter', we should surely be conscious of a certain inconcinnity (compare 7, also note 594). The intent of I. M. P., author of Turns With a Bookworm, an entertaining feature of New York Herald Tribune Books, was undoubtedly whimsical when she wrote (November 11, 1928, page 31), "The murder occurs *in* the library and *in* the first chapter; what more could one ask?" She does much the same thing again when she says (February 17, 1929, page 23), "Over in France Regis Michaud's 'The American Novel To-day' was awarded the Montyon prize of 18,500 francs . . . . This book was written *in* America, and *in* English." Here I fancy the effect that the writer is striving to produce is one of emphasis rather than of humor, inasmuch as the award of a *French* prize to a book written as indicated by the two *in* phrases seems surprising. Compare also the close of note 594. [67]Compare 18–19.

[68]But it is doubtless possible. Compare the further discussion of this point, 145 and note 609.

[69]The repetition of the relative replaces a connective. Compare note 166.

[70]There is an additional peculiarity here, inasmuch as *quo . . . equo* belongs with *ibat*, *quibus . . . in armis* with *ibat . . . aureus*. The resulting destruction of the parallelism would be too objectionable to allow us to regard *quo . . . equo* as dependent on *ibat* and *quibus . . . in armis* as dependent on *aureus*. Besides, the collocation of *equus* and *arma* seems to be a favorite one with Vergil. Compare 11.677–678, cited on 8 above, and 10.181 *equo* fidens et versicoloribus *armis*.

In 10.31–32 *sine pace* tua atque *invito numine* Troes Italiam petiere, the prepositional phrase is made coordinate with an ablative absolute (or possibly an ablative of attendant circumstance). Both expressions are, in logic, fully adverbial.

(b) Ablative and Accusative

Examples of the combination of a noun in the ablative without a preposition and a noun in the accusative with a preposition are 12. 501–502 quos *aequore* toto *in*que *vicem* nunc Turnus agit, 10.23–24 *intra portas* atque ipsis proelia miscent *aggeribus*, 12.476–477 nunc *porticibus* vacuis, nunc[71] umida *circum stagna* sonat, 9.680 sive Padi *ripis Athesim* seu *propter* amoenum, G. 1.340 extremae *sub casum* hiemis, iam *vere* sereno, G. 2.45–46 non hic te *carmine* ficto atque *per ambages* et longa *exorsa* tenebo.

Possibly to these may be added 10.313–314 huic *gladio per*que aeria *suta*, *per tunicam* squalentem auro latus haurit apertum. Here *-que* is apparently regarded, though not explicitly classed, by N. and K.[72] not as a connective, but merely as a correlative with another *-que* to be understood with the second *per*[73]. But there is just a faint chance that *-que* is a true copulative, uniting *gladio* with the prepositional phrases *per ... suta*, *per tunicam*, although there would be in the coupling of the ablative of means with the phrases of place an even greater violation of logical thought than usual.

(c) Dative and Accusative

It may perhaps be suggested that we find a noun in the accusative after a preposition combined with a noun in the dative in E. 5.5–6 sive *sub* incertas Zephyris motantibus *umbras*, sive *antro* potius succedimus, but this must be regarded as uncertain. C., although he cites an instance of *succedere sub* from Caesar (B.G. 1.24.4), seems to think that there is zeugma if not anacoluthon here rather than a mere example of non-parallelism, for he says, "probably Virg. in writing v. 5 meant some other word ⟨i.e. verb⟩ to follow 'sub umbras.' " I myself cannot see any objection to the copulation of *sub . . . umbras* and *antro*, since both expressions indicate goal; but I am not quite sure that the locution *is sub . . . umbras*. In view of the

[71] 'Connective repetition'. Compare note 46.

[72] They cite as parallels, respectively, E. 4.6 iam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna, and 2.227 sub pedibusque deae clipeique sub orbe teguntur. *Et* in the first is probably, and *-que* in the second is positively, a correlative. But at the same time, as we should not fail to observe, *et* in the first *may*, and *-que* in the second *must*, be regarded as having connective force.

[73] This *-que* is really replaced by the second *per*, as C. says, giving examples (on E. 4.6) of other instances where the repetition of a word does duty instead of a connective. (On this see note 46.) Compare 244, on 10.369–372.

fact that in the one other occurrence of *moto* in Vergil (E. 6.27–28 videres. . .rigidas *motare* cacumina quercus) the verb is transitive, I am inclined to believe that the complement of *sub* may be *Zephyris motantibus*, while *umbras* depends upon *motantibus*[74]. If this be true, the prepositional phrase cannot refer to *succedimus*, and we must supply instead some neuter verb such as *sumus*[75]. Still, in view of the fact that we have only one example of the transitive use of *moto*[76], and also of the very common tendency of transitive verbs of motion to become apparently intransitive by an ellipsis of *se*[77], the arguments in favor of this suggestion cannot be regarded as cogent.

In E. 8.101–102[78] fer cineres. . .foras *rivo*que fluenti *trans*que *caput* iace, the two local expressions are not quite parallel in thought, since the first designates the goal, the second the route[79].

(4) Two Prepositional Phrases not Quite Parallel

Examples of prepositional phrases that are not quite parallel are 5.109–110 munera. . .*ante oculos circo*que locantur *in* medio, 8.28–30 *in ripa* gelidique *sub* aetheris *axe*. . .procubuit, 11.881–883 *limine in* ipso, *moenibus in* patriis atque *inter tuta* domorum. . .exspirant animas, 12.849–850 *ad solium* saevique *in limine* regis apparent.

Sometimes the same preposition is used twice in different senses[80], with a resultant lack of parallelism which reminds us somewhat of what we call a zeugma[81]. Thus in 2.364–366 *per*que *vias* sternuntur inertia passim corpora *per*que *domos* et religiosa deorum *limina*, *per* with *vias* and *limina* seems to mean 'over', with *domos* 'throughout'[82]. In 6.461–462 quae nunc has ire *per umbras*, *per loca* senta situ cogunt *noctem*que profundam, *per* means 'among' with *umbras*, 'through'

[74]On the other hand, even if *umbras* does depend on *sub*, we might easily supply from it a second *umbras* to be the object of *motantibus* if, as certainly seems more picturesque, we desire to treat the verb as transitive. This is the view of Professor Knapp, who thinks me utterly wrong in my belief that the word governed by *sub* can possibly be *Zephyris*. He takes *Zephyris* as an instrumental ablative with *incertas*, which he regards as an example of the result, 'uncertain', instead of the process, 'made uncertain'. (Compare his note on *telo* in 1.99 in K.[1], and § 160 of his Introduction in K.[2].) I believe the word-order tends to support him—unless we are to suppose that Vergil has deliberately interwoven his words in an unnaturally complex way, to suggest the chequered patterns formed by the shadows of the leaves as the fitful breeze sways them (compare note 485).

[75]Then there is indubitably a zeugma.

[76]And after all even that may be intransitive, since there is just a possibilty that *cacumina* is an accusative of specification instead of a direct object.

[77]See K's. Introduction, § 139 in K.[1], § 151 in K.[2].

[78]According to the numbering in the Teubner and the Oxford texts; 102–103 in C.

[79]Compare the alternative suggestion made below, 124, in regard to 5.327–328.

[80]Compare note 66.

[81]Compare 7.

[82]Note the repetition of *per* with one complement, and its omission with another, both here and in the next example. Of course in spite of this the three phrases are in each case perfectly parallel. Compare the passages from Horace cited above, note 46.

with *loca*, 'during' with *noctem*[83]. In 2.183-184 hanc *pro Palladio* moniti, *pro numine* laeso effigiem statuere, *pro* with *Palladio* means 'in lieu of', with *numine laeso* 'to atone for'[84].

2. NON-PARALLEL VERBS

a. VERBS DIFFERING IN VOICE

(1) Finite Verbs

When finite verbs are used, a combination of active and passive forms is not, as a rule, particularly striking. We may, however, note one passage as rather remarkable for its variety, namely 6.179–182 *itur* in antiquam silvam. . . , *procumbunt* piceae, *sonat* icta securibus ilex, fraxineaeque trabes cuneis et fissile robur *scinditur*, *advolvunt* ingentis montibus ornos[85]. Here the impersonal *itur* (practically equivalent to *eunt*[86]) precedes two intransitive verbs, *procumbunt* and *sonat*, which, since the trees, the objects in fact and in logic acted upon, serve as their subjects, form perfect parallels for the following passive *scinditur*. After this passive the sudden shift to the active *advolvunt* is quite unexpected, and therefore all the more effective. The abruptness of the change is heightened by the chiastic order, which brings the two verbs together. The choppy manner employed in this passage belongs to the verses from Ennius, Annales 187–191 (Vahlen²), which Vergil, as C. reminds us, is undoubtedly imitating here. Such a style is well-suited to the subject-matter, and may have been deliberately retained by Vergil for this very reason.

(2) Infinitives

The union of active and passive infinitives is fairly common. Occasionally it may be due to the exigencies of the meter; but in one striking instance, 7.468–469 iubet arma *parari*, *tutari*[87] Italiam,

[83]The circumstance that in this case English, too, may use the same preposition throughout—namely, *through*—does not alter the fact that in both languages the meaning of the preposition shifts with each noun.

[84]The two *pro* phrases are, syntactically, completely parallel; otherwise the repetition would be decidedly objectionable. To be sure, there is no connective between the two prepositional phrases, but the principle is the same. Compare the preceding example, where we have first *per umbras*, *per loca*, but then *per loca . . . noctemque*, as was pointed out in note 82.

[85]We may note also the free combination of singular and plural in the names of the trees. On this see 5.

[86]Compare Roland G. Kent's statement (The Classical Weekly 5.162) that *ventum est* means 'they (he, we) came' more often than it does 'some one came'. (This observation is made in the course of a review of A Latin Grammar, by Harry Edwin Burton, The Classical Weekly 5.154–156, 162–164.)

[87]Of course *tutari*, since the verb is deponent, is the only possible form. And this very fact, that it *is* a deponent, may, as Professor Knapp has pointed out to me, be a contributing factor. Being passive in form, it *looks* natural after *parari*;

detrudere finibus hostem[88], both the first and the last infinitives might have been either active or passive, so far as the meter is concerned; so here, at least, we must ascribe the usage to Vergil's love of variety. In some passages we actually find a MS. variant that restores homogeneity, as *referre* in E. 6.85[89] (which Haverfield[90] and Hirtzel adopt), *linquere* in 3.61[91]; but a scribe who really knew Vergil would not be troubled by a shift of this sort. In every instance either active or passive construction could stand alone; it is their correlation that constitutes the incongruity.

Except in 3.60–61 omnibus idem animus, scelerata *excedere* terra, *linqui* pollutum hospitium et *dare* classibus Austros[92], the infinitives in question all occur in indirect discourse dependent on the verb *iubeo*. The active infinitive usually remains without a subject, the agent being indefinite, or at least not definitely named[93]. Thus the Latin combines in a single sentence a construction like the French 'il fait bâtir une maison' and the English 'he has a house built'. Examples are E. 6.85–86 *cogere* donec ovis stabulis numerumque

---

and being active in sense, it forms an easy transition to *detrudere*. For other transitional expressions, see note 441.

[88]See the following paragraph. [89]See the following paragraph.

[90]Haverfield, in revising C., overruled the latter without giving any indication that he was so doing. To be sure, he offered for *referre* the testimony of Servius and Nonius in addition to that cited by C.; but he quite ignored the fact that C., though well aware of the existence of MS. evidence in favor of *referre*, finally decided that the lection *referri* was "more probable as the more difficult reading". I sometimes find myself wondering precisely what the province of a reviser should be! Ought he, without new evidence or argument, arbitrarily reverse the reasoned judgment of the authority whom he is revising? Compare notes 534 and 944 for other instances of the same sort of behavior on Haverfield's part. With Haverfield's attitude we may contrast that of Nettleship, who, in *his* revision of C's. work, went counter to his own convictions and retained the spelling *Virgil*, "in deference to Conington's authority", as he tells us in his Preface to the Fourth Edition of volume I (see I.ix).

[91]See the next paragraph.

[92]Another possible exception is 10.55–57 quid pestem *evadere* belli iuvit et Argolicos medium *fugisse* per ignis totque maris vastaeque *exhausta* pericula terrae, if we supply *esse* with *exhausta*. But probably *exhausta* is a participle, not an infinitive, the phrase being of the '*ab urbe condita*' type; and in that case the example belongs not here but below, 100.

[93]There is an interesting example of the union of the indefinite subject with a subject specifically named, in G. 3.295–298 edico . . . herbam *carpere ovis* . . . et multa duram stipula filicumque maniplis *sternere* subter humum. C. understands a dative *tibi* or *pastoribus* with *edico*. . . *carpere ovis*, and an accusative *te* or *pastores*, referring to the same person or persons as this dative, as subject of *sternere*. P. does not attempt to supply the missing dative; the missing subject accusative he calls "the shepherd". A precisely similar shift—less noticeable because of the intervening clause 332–334—occurs just below, 329–336 <quarta hora> ad puteos aut alta *greges* ad stagna iubebo currentem ilignis *potare* canalibus undam; aestibus at mediis umbrosam *exquirere* vallem . . .; tum tenuis *dare* rursus aquas et *pascere* rursus solis ad occasum.

A parallel from Greek is perhaps to be found in Euripides, Electra 427–429 σκοπῶ τὰ χρήμαθ' ὡς ἔχει μέγα σθένος, φίλοις τε δοῦναι σῶμά τ' εἰς νόσον πεσὸν δαπάναισι σῶσαι. Here with δοῦναι, precisely as with *dare* in the preceding example, we

referri[94] iussit, 5.772–773 tris. . .vitulos et. . .agnam *caedere* deinde iubet *solvi*que ex ordine funem, 7.468–469 iubet arma *parari*, *tutari* Italiam, *detrudere* finibus hostem[95]. But in 11.83–84 iubet truncos. . . ipsos *ferre* duces inimicaque nomina *figi*, we actually have the subject of the active infinitive expressed, whether this subject is *truncos*, as Servius thinks, or *duces*, in accordance with what certainly seems to be the natural and obvious explanation.

b. VERBS DIFFERING IN TENSE[96]

The combination of verbs in different tenses very frequently involves simply the use of the historical present as equivalent to a past tense.

may supply an indefinite subject. On the other hand, the subject for σῶσαι is, I think, supplied by τὰ χρήμαθ'. To be sure, we might say that the two infinitives are used uniformly, both alike with an indefinite subject, or both alike with τὰ χρήμαθ' as the subject, and that the sense is simply 'money has great power, both for the purpose of making gifts to friends and for the purpose of healing the diseased body through expenditures'; but I think it is much more natural to accept the interpretation suggested above, and let τὰ χρήμαθ' supply an object for the first infinitive and a subject for the second.

Very like the Greek passage is an English one occurring in Command, by Albert Richard Wetjen, a story printed in the O. Henry Memorial Award Prize Stories of 1926, 36–46 (Garden City, Doubleday, Page and Company, 1927). The passage, found on page 44, runs thus: "Officers were given him for him *to command and order*, not *to take responsibility* from him." Here *officers*, used as the object of *to command and order* and as the subject of *to take responsibility from him*, corresponds closely to χρήμαθ', used as the object of δοῦναι and as the subject of σῶσαι. The sentence would be more closely parallel to the Greek had the phrase *for him*, which serves as a quasi-subject for the infinitive *to command and order*, been omitted, as is the indefinite subject of δοῦναι, and also that of *sternere* in the first Latin passage and of *dare* and *pascere* in the second. There is a further difference between the English and the Latin passages in that, while the second infinitive of the English, *to take responsibility*, has to have a subject supplied by the subject of the main verb, the Latin infinitives *carpere* and *potare* . . . *at* . . . *exquirere* have their own subjects expressed, respectively *ovis* and *greges*. In other words, in Latin and English alike we have a combination of infinitives with and without subjects expressed; but the English infinitive with subject expressed corresponds to the Latin infinitive with subject understood, and *vice versa*. However, all four passages, Latin, Greek, and English, are alike in this fundamental respect, that in each we have a combination of active infinitives, whereas a combination of active and passive infinitives would have produced more logical parallelism.

This is perhaps the place to note a somewhat comparable lack of parallelism in 5.461–462 tum pater Aeneas *procedere* longius *iras* et *saevire* animis *Entellum* haud passus acerbis, where the subject of one infinitive does not at all correspond with that of the other. Much smoother and more logical would have been either *procedere iris et saevire animis Entellum* or *procedere iras et saevire animos Entelli*. This passage is cited again below, 84.

[94]For the variant reading *referre*, see the preceding paragraph and note 90.

[95]See what was said of this passage in the preceding paragraph.

[96]Naturally I do not include here passages where differences of tense are deliberately and logically used to denote differences of time, as, e. g., 2.578–582 (*aspiciet, ibit, videbit, occiderit, arserit, sudarit*) and 4.590–591 (*ibit, inluserit*).

(1) Indicative

(a) Present and Imperfect[97]

We may note 2.209 *fit* sonitus spumante salo,[98] iamque arva *tenebant*, and 2.254–259 et iam Argiva phalanx. . . *ibat*. . . , flammas cum regia puppis extulerat, fatisque deum defensus iniquis inclusos utero Danaos et pinea furtim *laxat* claustra Sinon[99]. In both these examples, the tenses employed by Vergil are precisely those best calculated to produce the effect he desires. Both occur in passages of extraordinary vividness and poignancy, describing, respectively, the killing of Laocoön and the taking of Troy. It is natural that this vividness and poignancy should be heightened by the use of the historical present. But the consistent use of the historical present would have one drawback, namely, that a single tense, the present, must do duty both for continuous and for instantaneous action, whereas in the past the two temporal ideas can be clearly differentiated by the use of two different tenses, the perfect and the imperfect[100]. Sometimes such differentiation is not very important. Thus we find the present used of a continuing state in 2.203–209[101], *incumbunt*, *tendunt*, *superant*, *legit*, *sinuat*, and, finally, *fit* in our example above; and in 2.250–253, *vertitur*, *complectitur*. But no other tense so well as the imperfect can realize to the full the pictorial possibilities of the awful continuity of the approach—prolonged, deliberate, inevitable—of the snakes swimming toward the doomed priest, or of the fleet sailing toward the doomed city. Then in vivid contrast comes the use of the instantaneous present—the snakes

---

[97]Compare the combinations of present and imperfect in examples of the '*cum inversum*' construction, 1.507–510, 2.567–569, 2.679–680, 3.300–305, 3.344–348, 3.521–523, 5.159–161, 5.327–329, 9.371–372, 11.781–784, 12.247–250. Compare note 112.

[98]This is K's. punctuation. The discrepancy becomes somewhat less marked if, with H., we replace the comma by a semicolon; and it disappears altogether if we follow C., who joins the *fit* clause with the preceding sentence, putting a semicolon before the clause in question, and a period after it.

[99]It is almost certain that *-que* joins *ibat* and *laxat*, as K. says, not *extulerat* and *laxat*.

[100]Compare Marindin's view with regard to G. 1.261–263 (cited on 25). Marindin appears to think that Vergil substituted the perfect for the present there to emphasize the fact that a given action is instantaneous and not continuous, just as I think that Vergil substituted the imperfect for the present here to emphasize the fact that a given action is continuous and not instantaneous. But Marindin does not illustrate or explain, as I think he should, the use of the perfect to refer to *present* time. The present tense as used in 261–262 is a *true* present, not an *historical* present such as we find in the excerpts from the Aeneid under discussion here. And that makes a considerable difference.

[101]But in *mactabat* (202), the imperfect is well used of the act in which Laocoön was engaged at the time of the snakes' appearance—an act which he was destined to leave forever unfinished.

make for Laocoön (*petunt*, 213); Sinon unbars the horse (*laxat*, 259) and the concealed warriors pour forth (*reddit* and *promunt*, 260).[102]

6.469–470 illa solo fixos oculos aversa *tenebat* nec magis incepto vultum sermone *movetur* is different from the two preceding examples. Here the present as well as the imperfect represents a continued action—indeed, the present seems to indicate an action of longer duration than does the imperfect. That is probably just the point: Dido kept her eyes averted during the short interview with Aeneas, while he was striving to soften her (*lenibat*, 468), but her

[102]1.471–472 Tydides multa *vastabat* caede cruentus, ardentisque *avertit* equos in castra belongs here if Wetmore is right in classing *avertit* as a present. Certainly we have the historical present used in the description of the next picture, 474–478 (*fertur*, *haeret*, *trahuntur*, *inscribitur*). But the use of a secondary tense of the subjunctive (*gustassent* and *bibissent*) immediately after *avertit* is decidedly in favor of the view that *avertit* is a perfect rather than a present. The combination of imperfect and perfect is not dealt with in this study; for of course, when a Roman unites these two tenses, we assume that two different kinds of action are actually meant (compare note 96), and so there is no anomaly to be accounted for. Still it may be of interest to consider this passage. F.-B. do not distinguish between the two verbs, believing that "the change from the imperfect tense is probably due to the metrical difficulty of handling the long imperfect forms"; but I am inclined to the opinion that no mere metrical considerations constrained Vergil here, especially since he could easily have introduced the longer verb form by simply substituting a shorter adjective for *ardentis*, and that there really is a distinction in force between *vastabat* and *avertit*. To my mind, the latter lacks the continuity of the former. (Of course this would apply just as much if *avertit* were a present: compare what was said just above with regard to the ambiguity of the historical present, and the need of using an imperfect in its stead when the idea of continuity is to be stressed.) The devastation of the camp, like the long, slow procession of the matrons (note *ibant* and *ferebant*, 479 and 480) or the equally prolonged refusal of the goddess to yield to their appeal (*tenebat*, 482), is certainly an affair of some duration of time, as C. shows by his use of the progressive in his English paraphrase, "was spreading havoc"—much more so than the simple act of driving the horses into camp (*avertit*). However, it cannot be denied that if we follow the same line of reasoning, we may be forced to admit that *vendebat* in 484 possibly also ought to be a perfect (unless we wish to increase the poignancy of Priam's harrowing experience by emphasizing the prolongation of his bargaining with Achilles, thereby attributing to that hero a stony resistance comparable almost to Minerva's own in line 482). And so perhaps it is better to seek a different reason for the use of the perfect in *avertit*, and accept K's. explanation that the perfect "shows that the poet is telling a story independent of the pictures, not describing what Aeneas saw". Then the clause becomes comparable to an indicative interpolation made by an author in his own person in the heart of a passage in indirect discourse. It is almost parenthetical, on a par with those parenthetical clauses introduced by a conjunction which are cited below on pages 67–77, especially those listed in note 293; and, like them (compare the discussion of E. 5.88–89 and 10.608 on 72–73 and 74), may be treated as an example of fusion. The two possibilities fused are *vastavit . . . -que avertit* (simple narration) and *vastabat* (*postea avertit*), with *vastabat* pictorial, i. e., descriptive of the picture, and the parenthesis explanatory or narrative. K's. statement, "the imperfects and the historical presents picture the scenes actually represented in the paintings", certainly is true not only of the lines (1.466–493) to which he applies it, but also of the two comparable passages, 6.20–30 (of the temple sculptures at Cumae) and 8.626–731 (of the carvings on Aeneas's shield), in neither of which is the perfect used to refer to a single detail (*resolvit* in 6.29 is surely, I think, a present, though Wetmore lists it as a perfect; and the perfect infinitive *procubuisse* in 8.631 stands for an action completed before the one portrayed, in other words it represents not a perfect indicative but a pluperfect, just like *raptaverat* in 1.483 and *distulerant* in 8.643).

unmoved state seems to have a quality of permanence about it like that of the marble image to which she is compared in 471.

(b) Present and Perfect

The combination of the present[103] and the perfect is particularly easy in passages in which the verbs in different tenses are not very closely connected in thought[104]. Thus 1.81–83 cavum conversa cuspide montem *impulit* in latus, ac venti velut agmine facto, qua data porta, *ruunt* et terras turbine *perflant*—so punctuated by K.—perhaps becomes simpler if, with C. and H., we place a colon instead of a comma after *latus*. Possibly, however, even here there is a reason for the distinction in tense: the action indicated by the presents not only is subsequent in time to that indicated by the perfect, but also is its direct consequence.

Similarly in 12.379–382 ⟨illum⟩ rota praecipitem. . . *impulit effundit*que solo, Turnusque . . . *abstulit* ense caput truncumque *reliquit*, the discrepancy between *impulit* and *effundit*[105] may be explained as representing a real difference in time, the first verb being regarded as a present perfect and the second as a present showing the result of the first. But we cannot but be somewhat disturbed by the use of two more perfects, *abstulit* and *reliquit*, *after* the present *effundit*[106].

10.301 donec rostra *tenent* siccum et *sedere* carinae is much easier, since the perfect of a verb denoting a change of state as *sido*[107] does often amounts practically to a present indicating the state to which a change is made[108].

---

[103]I. e., the historical present. Compare 21.

[104]We may compare the combination of presents in the main clause and perfects in the dependent clause, in 9.516–518 Teucri molem *volvunt*que *ruunt*que, quae *stravit* Rutulos late armorumque *resolvit* tegmina. (It seems probable that *resolvit* is a perfect like its coordinate *stravit*, rather than a present like *volvunt* and *ruunt*.)

[105]The variant reading *effudit* is very easy—and therefore probably wrong.

[106]For another difficulty involved in the passage, see 82.

[107]Although N. says, " 'Sedere' may be referred here indifferently to 'sedeo' or 'sido' ", I prefer to assume that it is from *sido*, since the tense is much harder to account for if it is from *sedeo*, which in Vergil never, I believe, indicates a *change* of state. (Compare the use of *sedeo* in 7.201, cited just below, note 108, as a contrast to the present example.) The only apparent exceptions are 6.192 viridi sedere solo and 10.785–786 imaque sedit inguine, where, however, the ablative suggests result of motion rather than process. And it will be noted that in both these cases we find the ambiguous perfect, just as in 10.301, so that these examples, too, may be referred to *sido* (though Wetmore, I notice, lists them, and also 10.301, under *sedeo*). A difficulty arises in that, according to G.-L. and to Lane, the simple verb *sido* has only *sidi* as a perfect, though in compounds *-sedi* also occurs. Harpers' Dictionary, too, gives only *sidi*, and so does K. in his Vocabulary in K.[1], but he adds *sedi* in K.[2].

[108]There seems to be no appreciable difference in time between a perfect expressing process such as *sedere* (from *sido*) here, and a present expressing result

In 3.561–562 haud minus ac iussi *faciunt*, primusque . . . *contorsit* . . . proram Palinurus, the use of the perfect may serve to emphasize the fact that Palinurus responds to the orders before any of his comrades (note *primus*). We may contrast the similar passage 3.236–237, where the present tense is retained throughout.

With respect to G. 1.261–263 durum *procudit* arator vomeris obtunsi dentem, *cavat* arbore lintres, aut pecori signum aut numeros *impressit* acervis, Marindin's explanation, printed by Haverfield, is that "the perfect in a series of present tenses may possibly be used because stamping a seal or ticket is a single action, hollowing a tree, etc., a prolonged one"[109].

Again in 4.227–228 non illum nobis genetrix pulcherrima talem *promisit* Graiumque ideo bis *vindicat* armis, C. suggests that the present may be explained by the fact that the effects of the preservation still continue[110]. On the other hand, K. justifies it on the ground that the rescue will not be complete until Aeneas shall come to Italy[111]: to him, he tells me, it seems really a conative present.

The present in 1.256 oscula *libavit* natae, dehinc talia *fatur* may be due to analogy, since it is possible that the common use of the perfects *ait* and *inquit*, which look like presents, may be a factor in the employment in the present of their synonym *fatur*.

(c) Present and Pluperfect[112]

Since the pluperfect is used to denote action already completed at some past time with reference to some other past action, the combination of this tense with the present amounts to much the same thing as that of the imperfect or the perfect with the present[113].

In E. 7.6–8 huc mihi . . . vir gregis ipse caper *deerraverat*, atque ego Daphnim *aspicio*, the tense of *deerraverat* is the only possible one, since the action indicated had *preceded* the finding of Daphnis by the

such as *sedetis* in 7.201 fluminis *intrastis* ripas portuque *sedetis*, where this present is quite accurately coupled with the perfect expressing motion, *intrastis*.

[109]This explanation seems to me not wholly satisfactory. See note 100.

[110]Compare 29 on 10.55–56. C. gives a similar explanation for the use of another present combined with a perfect, namely *creat* in 10.703–705 una quem <=Mimanta> nocte Theano in lucem . . . *dedit*, et . . . Cisseis . . . Parim *creat*. But it should be noted that in that passage there is just as much reason for a present in the case of *dedit* as in that of *creat*, if C's. view is correct. The reading, however, has been questioned. For a discussion of the whole passage, which is a most difficult and complicated one, see 63–64.

[111]The presence of *bis* complicates the matter somewhat. Perhaps *iterum* would be more exact, since the *first* rescue of Aeneas (for which see Iliad 5.311–317) was certainly complete (Apollo finished the task when Aphrodite abandoned it, 343–346, 431–453), whatever may be said of that described by Vergil in Aeneid 2.

[112]For examples of *cum inversum*, see 1.586–587, 2.323, 3.8–10, 3.655, 5.693–694, 11.903–905 (compare note 97). For a possible (though, to my mind, highly dubious) example with *ut*, see 9.47–49 (on this see note 692).

[113]Compare 22–25 and note 103.

narrator—itself a past occurrence. On the other hand, the historical present *aspicio* is immensely effective after *atque* in the sense of 'and lo'; as P. says, the use of the present "adds to the force of the idiom".

We find *atque* used in much the same way[114] in 4.663–664 *dixerat*, atque illam. . . conlapsam *aspiciunt* comites. The pluperfect *dixerat* is to all intents and purposes equivalent temporally to the perfect *desivit loqui* or *tacuit*. The form is employed similarly in 2.705–706 *dixerat* ille, et iam per moenia clarior ignis *auditur*, propiusque aestus incendia *volvunt*. Here the present—in *auditur* and *volvunt*—is well adapted to bring before our eyes and ears the close approach of the fire that was so alarming to the little group in Aeneas's home.

(d) Present and Future or Future Perfect

In 9.297–299 *erit* ista mihi genetrix nomenque Creusae solum *defuerit*, nec partum gratia talem parva *manet*, the combination of present and future is to be explained by the fact that the present of *maneo*, as a result of the meaning of the verb, is virtually equivalent to the future of such a verb as *sum*[115]. Exactly parallel is 7.318–319 sanguine . . . *dotabere* . . . , et Bellona *manet* te pronuba.

(e) Perfect and Pluperfect

In 4.200 centum aras *posuit* vigilemque *sacraverat* ignem, the change in tense, except on metrical grounds, seems hard to account for[116]. C. scarcely tries, contenting himself with the statement: "Wund. seems right in saying that 'posuit' and 'sacraverat' really refer to the same time, which is regarded from two different points of view." F.-B. seem almost to recognize a '*hysteron proteron*', if we may judge by their note: "the consecration of the fire had taken place once for all, when the first altar was set up. It had therefore preceded

---

[114]It hardly need be said that the sense is very similar to that conveyed by the use of *cum inversum*. Compare note 112.

[115]Compare 10.301 (24) for another verb whose root meaning has a bearing on its tense usage, and 2.193–194 (30) for another example with *manere*.

[116]It is true that some authorities hold that the Latin pluperfect was once equivalent to an aorist. For an expression of this view, see Charles E. Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin, Volume I, The Verb, 47, 50–52 (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1910). The theory there set forth is by no means universally accepted: for instance, Professor Knapp questions its validity, at least so far as Plautus and Terence are concerned, in his review of Bennett's work, A. J. P. 32 (1911), 333–343 (the point cited is to be found on page 337). But, even if we are willing to admit (1) that Bennett's statement is correct, and (2) that it can be applied to Vergil, still we have not accounted for the presence in the same verse of two verbs of *different* tenses referring to the same period.

the building of the many shrines. Hence the change of tense." K.[1] makes this explanation: "*posuit* pictures an act done at some undefined time in the past. *sacraverat* pictures an act of the same time defined with ref. to another past moment, i.e. that at which Fama came to Iarbas."[117] But K.[2] ascribes the use of *posuit* instead of *posuerat* purely to metrical necessity; and this explanation seems to me the simplest and most satisfactory. Vergil, I am sure, is never completely dominated by his medium; but even he must yield when confronted by a form containing three consecutive short syllables[118].

(2) Imperative

(a) Present and Future

I note a single certain instance of a combination of present and future imperatives, E. 3.106–107 *dic* quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus *habeto*. The change in tense is strictly logical, since the reward for answering the riddle, at once, is to be the acquisition of Phyllis, in the future. We may compare the use of the future indicative, *eris*, in the corresponding couplet, 104–105 (cited below, 34).

A second example perhaps occurs in 10.280–282 nunc coniugis *esto* quisque suae tectique memor, nunc[119] magna *referte* facta, patrum laudes. However, instead of *referte*, the lection accepted by H., N. adopts a second future imperative, *referto*. Good MS. authority supports both readings. *Referto*[120] is a closer parallel to *esto*; but the shift from *esto* to *referte* is not particularly difficult. The change in tense becomes almost inevitable, granted the change in person and number; we surely could not expect Vergil to use so clumsy a form as *refertote*! The change in person and number is easily accounted for, since in the first exhortation Turnus is appealing to his comrades individually, as is made clear by *coniugis* and *quisque*, and in the second he may well be addressing them collectively, as is suggested, though not proved, by *patrum*.

---

[117]This view is better suited by the insertion of a comma after *posuit*, as in C. and K.[2].

[118]Compare note 24 with regard to an equally impossible word, *capitibus*; and on the subject of metrical exigencies in general, see page 4.

[119]'Connective repetition'. Compare note 46.

[120]Very strangely, Wetmore classifies *referto* as a second person. It must of course be third, like *esto*, which he lists correctly.

(3) Subjunctive

(a) Imperfect and Pluperfect

We may note the use of one pluperfect subjunctive in connection with three imperfect subjunctives in 7.808–811 illa vel intactae segetis per summa *volaret* gramina nec teneras cursu *laesisset* aristas, vel mare per medium fluctu suspensa tumenti *ferret* iter celeris nec *tingeret* aequore plantas. Here K. suggests three possible explanations for the use of the pluperfect: (1) love of variety; (2) metrical convenience; (3) actual change of meaning. So far as metrical convenience is concerned, I am, as usual, inclined to rule this out as a truly cogent factor. On this in general see 4, and observe particularly note 122, which deals with metrical considerations so far as they affect the use of present and perfect infinitives, and therefore, because of the similarity in form, is fairly applicable to the use of imperfect and pluperfect subjunctives. The first cause suggested by K., desire for variety on Vergil's part, is the only one offered by C.; but the latter's proposed translation corresponds more closely to K's. third cause, implying as it does an actual shift in meaning, as may be seen if we compare the paraphrases offered by C. and K. respectively, "she would fly over standing corn and not leave the ears crushed behind her", "nor would she have left . . . injured". C. says that Vergil regards "the crushing of the ears as having taken place while the action indicated by 'volaret' was still going on"; K. suggests that the pluperfect "may be meant to emphasize the completion of the act referred to". I think the point may be made that the action indicated by *laesisset*, the injury to the grain, is the only one of the four enumerated that could under any circumstances produce lasting results, and might therefore be regarded as completed; the corresponding result in the second instance, *tingeret*, the wetting of her feet, on the other hand, would be merely transient and temporary, enduring hardly longer than the action denoted by *ferret*, and therefore naturally placed in the same tense.

(4) Infinitive

(a) Present and Past

The view seems to be current with respect to the epic as well as with respect to the elegy, that the use of the past infinitive is primarily a matter of metrical convenience[121]. But it appears possible

[121]Compare C's. reference to Gossrau's note on 3.431, "that the Roman poets were fond of using the perf. inf. for metrical reasons, if a past notion could be intro-

to account for Vergil's employment of the past infinitive on other, and far more satisfactory, grounds[122].

Thus in 3.429–432 praestat Trinacrii metas *lustrare* Pachyni cessantem, longos et *circumflectere* cursus, quam semel informem vasto *vidisse*[123] sub antro Scyllam, the perfect is a true perfect, a tense of completed action reinforcing the idea conveyed by *semel*. Professor Knapp suggests to me that, had the Trojans gone straight on, seeing Scylla would have preceded, forever, the other two actions: indeed, the wanderers would not have survived to perform them.

In 10.55–56 quid pestem *evadere* belli iuvit et Argolicos medium *fugisse* per ignis, the tense of *evadere* is perhaps to be justified on the ground that this action, or at least its immediate result, is still in effect[124]. 3.282–283 iuvat *evasisse* tot urbes Argolicas mediosque fugam *tenuisse* per hostis is different, as *evasisse . . . urbes* is a more separate, absolute sort of act than *pestem evadere*, corresponding, indeed, rather to the specific *Argolicos medium fugisse per ignis* of 10.55–66 than to the general and prolonged *pestem evadere belli*.

---

duced with any shadow of propriety". This view seems to be corroborated by the conclusions reached by Albert A. Howard as a result of his careful study, On the Use of the Perfect Infinitive in Latin with the Force of the Present, in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 1.111–138. The pertinent part of Howard's summary of his findings runs as follows (137–138): ". . . first, the present infinitive of a large number of verbs which they <the poets, and especially the elegiac poets> wished to use, on account of metrical difficulties could not be used in their verse, or could only be used under certain restrictions; second, the perfect infinitive of these verbs was peculiarly adapted to the necessities of the last half of pentameter verse. The infinitive in this use seemed to have the force of an aorist infinitive in Greek, and, in course of time, came to be used by the poets even where the metre admitted the use of the present infinitive."

[122]Compare 4 for an expression of scepticism as to the adequacy, in the consideration of the peculiarities of Vergil's style, of explanations based on metrical grounds alone. It may be noted in this connection that Howard, in the article referred to in note 121, lists only seven examples from Vergil, in four of which he believes the infinitive has either perfect or future perfect force, so that the number of instances in which we are to conclude that Vergil uses the perfect infinitive without a perfect sense, and therefore perhaps *metri causa*, is only three, an almost infinitesimal figure as compared with those applying to other poets. To be sure, it might be said that Vergil would not be expected to show so great a number of instances as the elegiac poets; but it is fair to compare him with Horace as a writer of dactylic hexameters. Horace's Satires and Epistles total less than a third of the number of verses in Vergil's major works (4,081 as compared with 12,914); yet out of twelve instances cited from the Satires and Epistles, nine are listed as perhaps used *metri causa*, in contrast with the three mentioned above for Vergil.

[123]The infinitive *vidisse* balances the earlier *lustrare* and *circumflectere*, being joined to them not by a coordinating conjunction such as *et*, but by the subordinating conjunction *quam*. This type of collocation appears pertinent, just as does that by means of *cum* referred to in note 627.

[124]Compare 25 on 4.227–228.

In 10.888–889 tot *traxisse* moras, tot spicula taedet *vellere*[125], the use of the perfect heightens the effect. It is the actual performance of the action indicated by *vellere* that is wearying, but it is not so much each successive delay that depresses the hero, as the fact that he has had to endure so many delays already, the prolongation of the agony by their agency being aggravated by a view in retrospect.

Likewise in 10.14 tum *certare* odiis, tum res *rapuisse*[126] licebit, it seems probable that *rapuisse* actually indicates a different time from that implied by *certare*. N. says of *rapuisse*, "Perhaps the perfect tense may be pressed here" (in its relation to *licebit*), but he does not endeavor to account for the use of the present in *certare*. We may perhaps derive a helpful hint as to *certare* from his note on *res rapuisse*: this locution, following Servius, he explains as including the preliminary acts of violence, and also the subsequent reprisals if satisfaction were refused—all of which he sums up by the words "a state of turmoil". In short, *res rapuisse* will embrace in its meaning all the opening hostilities; *certare*, the steady, continuous struggle that succeeds them. The two expressions will bear the same mutual relation as do the two infinitives *procubuisse* and *ludere* in 8.630–632 fecerat. . . . *procubuisse* lupam, geminos huic ubera circum *ludere*, where likewise the perfect infinitive indicates not so much a past action as the present result of this action[127]; but they will differ from this example in their order[128], which is that of '*hysteron proteron*'.

(b) Present and Future

In 2.193–194 Asiam magno Pelopea ad moenia bello *venturam* et nostros ea fata *manere* nepotes, as in 9.299, quoted above (26), the present of *maneo* can easily be made coordinate with the future of another verb. However, K. says that the present "pictures the certainty of the future happenings predicted by the seer". He has made to me the interesting comment that "the 'prophetic present' is a foil to the historical present. It does to the future what the historical present does to the past. The historical present and the 'prophetic' present bring past or future up to the writer or the speaker as a telescope brings an object close to the observer."

---

[125] 'Connective repetition'. Compare note 46.
[126] Compare note 125.
[127] Compare note 102, end, and note 108.
[128] On this we may compare the view of F.-B. on 4.200, quoted on pages 26–27.

(5) Participles

(a) Present and Past

In consequence of the limitations of the Latin participial system, a present active and a past passive (or deponent) participle may in poetry be almost equivalent in temporal force[129], as in 4.690 sese *attollens* cubitoque *adnixa*, 12.781 diu *luctans* lentoque in stirpe *moratus*, 1.295 saeva *sedens* super arma et centum *vinctus* aënis, 8.640 *armati* . . . paterasque *tenentes*, 11.101 *velati* ramis oleae veniamque *rogantes*. But in such cases as the last two cited, the two participles are not quite parallel, since in both the first participle indicates a state, a result of an action, and the second indicates an action, a process[130].

c. VERBS DIFFERING IN MOOD USAGE

(1) Verbs in the Same Mood Used in Different Ways

5.59–60 *poscamus* ventos, atque haec me sacra quotannis urbe *velit* posita templis sibi ferre dicatis presents the combination of a volitive (hortatory) subjunctive and an optative subjunctive[131].

(2) Verbs in Different Moods

(a) Indicative and Infinitive

We find several examples of the historical infinitive combined with the indicative, apparently without appreciable difference in meaning.

In 2.169–170 ex illo *fluere* ac retro sublapsa *referri* spes Danaum, *fractae* vires, *aversa* deae mens, the infinitives *fluere* and *referri* may suggest continued or perhaps inceptive[132] action in contradistinction to the perfect indicatives *fractae* (*sunt*) and *aversa* (*est*); but it may be that no distinction whatsoever is intended.

---

[129]Compare G.-L., § 282, Note; Harkness, § 640.1; Lane, § 2280; K., Introduction, K.[1], § 171, K.[2], § 186.

[130]Hence the two examples are listed again below, 174.

[131]Unless, as is perhaps more likely, *velit* is coordinated not with *poscamus* but with *ventos*. In that case the example should be cited rather with the combinations of nouns and clauses listed below, 88–98: see especially 98. However, there is scant difference in meaning between *poscamus velit* and the independent *velit* (for this compare note 136), so that the two interpretations come to much the same thing.

[132]This seems to be the common force of the historical infinitive. Compare Quintilian's explanation (9.3.58) of an example containing an historical infinitive as involving the ellipsis of *coepit*. Such a view on the part of a sensitive stylist, even though scientifically not acceptable, is of prime importance for an understanding of the effect conveyed by the construction in question. See G.-L., § 647, Note 1, and Stolz-Schmalz[5], page 591.

Again in 3.140–142 *linquebant* dulcis animos aut aegra *trahebant* corpora; tum sterilis *exurere* Sirius agros, *arebant* herbae et victum seges aegra *negabat*, the infinitive *exurere* seems to suggest the idea of continuance, exactly as do the imperfect indicatives which follow, *arebant* and *negabat* (those which precede, *linquebant* and *trahebant*, suggest rather the idea of repetition). It might be said that *arebant* and *negabat* express action of rather longer duration than *exurere*, since the conditions that they denote would endure even after the action indicated by *exurere* had ceased; but this seems highly questionable.

On the other hand, in 3.666–668 nos . . . fugam trepidi *celerare* . . tacitique *incidere* funem, *verrimus*[133] et proni certantibus aequora remis, the indicative, which is almost assuredly present, may denote an action more prolonged than the actions indicated by the two infinitives. But probably we are simply to regard the three verbs as picturing three separate, successive acts, no one of which is to be thought of as differing from the others in its temporal implications.

Certainly, in 9.507 *quaerunt* pars aditum et scalis *ascendere* muros, no distinction can be recognized between historical present indicative and historical infinitive, if *ascendere* is to be regarded as an instance of the latter construction. But another view is also possible concerning the use of this word: for this see below, 102[134].

(b) Indicative and Subjunctive

In G. 1.36–37 nam te nec *sperant*[135] Tartara regem, nec tibi regnandi *veniat* tam dira cupido, the subjunctive is probably potential[136], possibly volitive or optative.

---

[133]H. reads *vertimus*: but C's. arguments in favor of *verrimus* seem convincing to me. It may be noted that *vertimus*, like *verrimus*, is ambiguous in form, but is almost surely to be regarded as present. Wetmore, who lists only *verrimus* for this line, takes it as present.

[134]Compare the similar doubt in respect to 5.59–60 (note 131).

[135]The reading *sperent* exists, but has not met with acceptance among modern editors.

[136]I am inclined to view the subjunctive as potential, since Vergil is giving his reasons for not placing Caesar in Tartarus (note *nam*, and compare P's. note), and one of these would be the unlikelihood of Caesar's desiring to have a place there, not Vergil's wish that he may not so desire. We may note C's. paraphrase: "The honour is too great for Tartarus to hope; and you cannot be so desirous of empire on any terms as to wish to be king there." The implied contrast (not a very strong one, of course) is between Tartarus's expectations and Caesar's probable actions, not between Tartarus's hopes and Vergil's prayers. Those who prefer the latter view may say that *nec . . . veniat . . . cupido* is equivalent to *spero cupidinem non venturam esse*, and compare what was said above (note 131) of *velit* as an equivalent of *poscamus velit*.

In E. 10.16–17 nostri nec *paenitet* illas, nec te *paeniteat* pecoris, the subjunctive is volitive (jussive).

In 12.188 ut potius *reor* et potius di numine *firment*, the subjunctive is optative. See further on this passage below (74).

In 2.108–111 saepe fugam Danai Troia *cupiere* relicta moliri et . . . discedere bello; *fecissent*que utinam! saepe illos aspera ponti *interclusit* hiems et *terruit* Auster euntis, the subjunctive is optative. The case here is complicated by the circumstance that *fecissentque utinam* is parenthetical[137], as most of the editors indicate by their pointing[138].

We may perhaps compare also 2.120–121 obstipuere animi gelidusque per ima cucurrit ossa tremor, cui fata *parent*, quem *poscat* Apollo. Here, to be sure, we have as parallels two indirect questions, both of course in the subjunctive; but the direct questions represented by these, if N., not C., be right and *fata* is an accusative, are non-parallel, presenting a combination of a deliberate subjunctive and an indicative—"cui fata *paremus*, quem *poscit* Apollo?" However, I am much more inclined to follow C. in taking *fata* as a nominative, and regarding the original direct question as running simply: "cui fata parant, quem poscit Apollo?" It seems to me far more effective to make *fata* parallel to *Apollo*, both in syntax, as being a nominative, and in thought, as referring to some supernatural agency. I note with interest that Professor Knapp, though in his first edition he expressed a view similar to that of N., in his second edition has changed to one similar to that of C.

(c) Indicative and Imperative[139]

In E. 7.35–36 nunc te marmoreum pro tempore *fecimus*; at tu, si fetura gregem suppleverit, aureus *esto*, we should certainly expect *eris*, like *stabis* in the corresponding couplet, 31–32[140]; but the imperative is, as P. puts it, "more lordly and magnificent". Its em-

[137]Compare below, 67–77. See especially what is said (75–76) of the very similar parenthesis in 3.614–615. In the same section (page 74) is mentioned the possibility that the subjunctive clause in the previous example, 12.188, may also be parenthetical, although it probably is not.

[138]H. does not so punctuate, though he uses parentheses in the parallel passage 3.615. C. uses dashes, K. parentheses, in both places.

[139]We may observe an interesting English example, P's. note on E. 8.74: "Many editors say that *terna* is put poetically for *tria* and Virgil merely describes three single threads each of a single colour, but this *neglects triplici*, and *see* line 78 n." This is clearly a fusion of '. . . this neglects *triplici*. See also line 78 n.' and '. . . this neglects *triplici*, and line 78 is also against it'.

[140]Si proprium hoc fuerit, levi de marmore tota puniceo stabis suras evincta coturno.

ployment is probably to be regarded as a part of the absurd ostentation that makes Thyrsis seek to cap Corydon's marble Diana by a golden Priapus.

E. 3.104–105 *dic* quibus in terris—et *eris* mihi magnus Apollo—tris pateat caeli spatium non amplius ulnas[141] is not an example of inconcinnity of the same type, since it is really a quasi-paratactic substitute for *si dixeris, eris*. Another possibility would be a double imperative, *dic et esto*[142], such as we actually find in the corresponding couplet 106–107[143].

In 12.176–181 *esto* nunc Sol testis et haec mihi Terra vocanti,. . . et pater omnipotens et tu Saturnia coniunx, . . .tuque inclute Mavors, cuncta tuo qui bella, pater, sub numine torques, Fontisque Fluviosque *voco*, we must certainly regard *esto* and *voco* as coordinated if we adopt the punctuation of K.[1] and place a comma after *torques* (180). On the other hand K.[2], N., and H. have a semicolon after *torques*, and this is perhaps a sign that they take the first *-que* in 181 as correlative with the second, not as a connective[144]—though if this is the case, a period would, it seems to me, be preferable to the semicolon. But of course logically there is not the slightest difficulty about regarding *esto* and *voco* as coordinates, since the *meaning* of the verb *voco* makes it a suitable parallel for the imperative mood of any other verb[145].

(d) Subjunctive and Imperative

In 4.494–497 tu secreta pyram. . .*erige*, et arma viri. . .exuviasque omnis lectumque iugalem, quo perii, *superimponas*, the lack of parallelism is not very striking, since the second verb, whether we read *superimponas* with K. and H., or *super imponant*[146] with C., is a jussive subjunctive, which amounts to practically the same thing as an imperative.

A close parallel to 4.494–497, especially if we read *imponant* rather than *imponas*, is 9.234–235 *audite* o mentibus aequis, Aeneadae, neve haec nostris *spectentur* ab annis.

---

[141]There is a second complication here, as in 2.108–111 (cited on 33), in that the second clause is parenthetically used.

[142]On the change in tense, compare page 27.

[143]Dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus habeto.

[144]Compare 138 on 2.591–592, and note 580.

[145]Compare notes 131 and 136.

[146]C. says, "Anna would naturally require assistance, so the plural is not inconsistent with the injunction of secrecy". This may be true enough; and indeed *secreta* in 494 may imply simply seclusion, not necessarily secrecy at all; but even if Anna is to have helpers, would it not be more natural to address to her the

(e) Subjunctive and Infinitive

We have an extremely doubtful instance[147] of the grouping of a subjunctive and an infinitive in 12.634–636 sed quis Olympo demissam tantos voluit te *ferre* labores? an fratris miseri letum *ut* crudele *videres*?

The subjunctive is in an indirect command, and the infinitive is in an indirect statement, in 3.234–235 sociis tunc arma *capessant* edico, et dira bellum cum gente *gerendum*[148]. Aeneas's own words were, as K. says, "arma capessite: bellum. . .gerendum (est)." It would be more logical, but unendurably cumbersome, if in putting these words into O.O., one made *et* join the *edico* = *impero*, governing *capessant*, with a second *edico* = *aio*, governing *gerendum* (*esse*).

---

orders which are to be executed under her supervision? Do we not repeatedly say 'do this' when we mean 'have this done'? For instance, when Horace, in Sermones 1.6.77–78, says, *artis quas doceat quivis eques atque senator semet prognatos*, he surely does not mean that the knight or the senator performs the teaching personally. Again, when Damasippus (Sermones 2.3.308) says to Horace, *aedificas*, the implication is not that Horace himself does the building, any more than it would be in the corresponding English 'You're building a house'.—On the other hand, it is an open question whether Anna really does "require assistance". C. himself comments on the fact that "in the actual narrative, 5.507 <this is an obvious misprint for 4.507, which should be 4.507–508>, Dido is made to do these things herself"; it is odd that he does not note that *she* does them without "assistance".

[147]The doubt here amounts almost to a certainty in the opposite direction, for Vergil does not use *ut* to introduce an object clause after *volo*; and it is far more likely that the *ut* clause is one of purpose. For this view see note 61, fifth paragraph.

[148]We may compare the combination of the periphrastic infinitive and the simple infinitive in 2.176–177 *temptanda*...canit aequora Calchas, nec *posse*... *exscindi* Pergama. This represents an original statement on Calchas's part, "temptanda (sunt) aequora, nec possunt <or possibly poterunt> exscindi Pergama". A not dissimilar example in English occurs in an article by William Linn Westermann on The Greek Papyri as Historical Material, 59 (The Classical Weekly 19.51–55, 59–62), "He warns the Jews *that they should not continue* the attempt to force themselves into the athletic games of the Greeks, but *to be* content with the privileges which they already enjoyed." The direct discourse here would be, "You should not continue the attempt . . . , but *be* <imperative> content. . . ." We may also compare The Pickwick Papers, Chapter 22, "Tell my servant *to bring* me up some hot water at half-past eight in the morning, and *that I shall not want* him any more to-night."

We may note also 9.230–232 Nisus et...Euryalus...*admittier* orant, rem magnam pretiumque morae *fore*, in which there are two different types of infinitives, the first representing a subjunctive (*admittamur*) or perhaps, like *capessant* in 3.234, an imperative (*admittite nos*), and the second, like *gerendum* (*esse*) in 3.235, representing an indicative (*erit*). In that two unlike forms of the direct discourse are represented by two like forms in the indirect discourse, we may compare 2.120–121 if it is interpreted according to N's. view (see 33). But 9.230–231 differs from 3.234–235, 2.176–177, and 2.120–121 in that, neither in the indirect discourse nor in the direct discourse that it represents, are the two verbs connected. Indeed, in the indirect discourse, the second infinitive really depends not on *orant* at all, but on some verb of saying implied thereby. In this respect, the passage is perhaps to be compared with 7.149–151, if Professor Knapp's view thereof is accepted (for which see 104), and with 11.896–900, if my suggestion thereon is accepted (for which see 105–106).

On the other hand in 2.74–75 hortamur *fari* quo sanguine cretus, quidve ferat; *memoret* quae sit fiducia capto[149], there seems to be no distinction between the infinitive and the subjunctive, since both represent imperatives.

3. NON-PARALLEL CLAUSES

a. RELATIVE CLAUSE COORDINATED WITH FOLLOWING NON-RELATIVE CLAUSE

In a number of the foregoing examples, instances were noted of a lack of concinnity not merely between verbs, but between the entire clauses in which the verbs figure[150]. Two clauses that are not really parallel are frequently united in the following manner also: a relative pronoun introducing a clause is made to do duty also in introducing a second clause, which may logically require (Class I) a relative in a different case, or possibly (Class II) no relative at all[151].

The same phenomenon occurs with other types of words. From the nature of the case, instances of the type of Class I are more common, or at least more obvious, than those of the type of Class II.

Thus I note several passages in which, from a certain noun that occurs in a given case, we must supply another case of the same noun[152]. In 1.229–230 *res hominumque deumque. . .regis* et fulmine

---

[149]There is no conjunction, to be sure; but *fari* and *memoret* are parallel none the less, though perhaps the infinitive is a little more closely connected with the main verb than is the subjunctive. The latter, indeed, might even be said to be used independently, in 'implied indirect discourse'; but I do not believe its relation with *hortamur* is so remote as that. If we go a step further in this direction, we shall reach the view of C., who places a semicolon after *fari* instead of before *memoret*, thus grouping all three indirect questions with the latter verb, in order, as he says, "to make all that follows <*fari*> an oratio obliqua". But this succession of coordinate indirect questions, the first and second joined by *-ve* and the third without a connective, seems to me very harsh, and I far prefer the grouping of K. and H. (on this see note 379).

[150]E. g., 5.59–60, 2.169–170 (31), 3.140–142, 3.666–668, G. 1.36–37(32), 12.188, 2.121 (33), 12.176–181 (34), 3.234–235 (35).

[151]It must be noted that, whereas it is certainly quite correct to class as non-parallel two clauses one of which is introduced by a relative while the other is not (Class II), it is perhaps not quite so accurate to include under this head a combination of two clauses both of which are really relative clauses, simply because a single relative pronoun is made to do duty for both in spite of the fact that the second clause demands another form of this relative, in a different case (Class I). Examples of this type doubtless belong rather under the head of that particular variety of illogical coordination known as zeugma (see note 3). But it seems more satisfactory to treat in one place the entire question of the inexact use of the relative, and kindred matters that tend to illustrate, or to be illustrated by, this particular phenomenon; and, since exact classification is, after all, but a matter of convenience, I have chosen here as elsewhere (see note 18) to sacrifice the lesser to the greater convenience.

[152]With these we may perhaps compare passages in which, from the occurrence of a certain verb in a given tense, we must supply another tense of the same

terres, we supply the accusative *hominesque deosque* with *terres*[153]. In 6.542–543 *malorum exercet poenas* et ad. . .Tartara *mittit*, we supply the accusative *malos* with *mittit*. In G. 3.416–417 *sub immotis praesepibus*. . .vipera *delituit* caelumque. . .*fugit*, we supply the phrase *sub immota praesepia* with *fugit*[154]. In 6.317 *miratus*. . . *motus*que *tumultu*, we supply the accusative *tumultum* with *miratus*.[155]

A similar instance with adjectives instead of nouns is 2.642–643 *una*. . .vidimus *excidia* et *captae* superavimus *urbi*, where we must supply the dative *uni* with *urbi*[156].

---

verb. Such passages are G. 2.1–2 *hactenus* arvorum cultus et sidera caeli, *nunc* te, Bacchi, *canam*, where we must supply the perfect *cecini* with *hactenus*; and G. 1.420–422 pectora motus *nunc* alios, alios *dum nubila ventus agebat, concipiunt*, where we must supply the past *concipiebant* or *conceperunt* with *dum nubila ventus agebat*. (On the latter passage, see further below, 139–140.)

[153]C., however, regards *res hominumque deumque* as object of *terres* also, explaining that the phrase is "taken in a loose sense for the universe". He might have adduced as evidence on his side 5.690 Teucrum res eripe leto, of which he says that "the things really involve persons" (obviously, the phrase *leto eripio* is usually employed only of persons: compare 2.134 eripui . . . leto me). And yet it seems hard to think of *res* as an entity sufficiently sentient to feel terror.

[154]Unless *fugit* means 'shuns, avoids' here rather than 'flees', which, however, seems less likely.

[155]With these examples we may contrast several in which the noun is repeated, always, apparently, for the sake of some distinct rhetorical purpose. In 10.149 *regem* adit et *regi* memorat nomenque genusque, the emphatic use of *regem*. . .*regi* seems to call attention to the importance of Aeneas's conference. We may note in this connection the similar verbal repetition in 12.289–291 Messapus *regem regis*que insigne gerentem . . . Aulesten . . . proterret; but we must at the same time observe that this passage is quite different, for in it *regem* and *regis* do not refer to the *same* person: *regem* refers specifically to Aulestes, and *regis* stands for any king, so that neither word could possibly be omitted. (See further on this passage note 54 and page 168.) The order here of the words *regem regisque insigne* is like that in 11.139–140 Fama volans, tanti praenuntia luctus, *Euandrum Euandri*que domos et moenia replet. The latter passage decidedly does belong in the class at present under consideration, in which the repetition of the noun is contrary to the norm, and consequently productive of special rhetorical effect. The double use of Evander's name heightens the reader's sense of the deep pathos and the wide extent of the calamity that has befallen him. In 10.810 *Lausum* increpitat *Lauso*que minatur, the repetition of the victim's name suggests the repetition of the champion's challenges and threats: we can almost hear Aeneas shouting Lausus's name as he pursues him. 9.438–439 *solum*. . . *Volcentem* petit, in *solo Volcente* moratur and 10.442–443 *solus ego* in *Pallanta* feror, *soli mihi Pallas* debetur are similar, but more complicated: they involve the repetition of other words beside the nouns.

To the foregoing examples we may add 3.607–608 *genua* amplexus *genibus*que volutans haerebat, provided that the knees referred to are the Trojans' in both cases. K. supplies *nostra* with the first and *suis* with the second; but C., by calling *genibus* a local ablative, shows that he interprets this word as referring to the Trojans. So do F.-B.; but they take the ablative not, as do C. and K., with *volutans*, but with *haerebat* (though certainly, as C. says, the structure of the sentence favors the other interpretation). In that case *amplexus*, though F.-B. translate it as parallel to *volutans*, is probably a finite verb parallel to *haerebat*. The repetition of the noun is still noticeable; but the entire sentence, it seems to me, is less forceful.

[156]Or, perhaps, following C., the adverb *semel*, with *captae*.

An example with personal pronouns[157] is G. 2.475–477 *me. . .*Musae *. . .accipiant* caelique vias et sidera *monstrent*, in which we must supply the dative *mihi* with *monstrent*. With this we may compare an illustration of the similar use of demonstrative pronouns[158], G. 4.215–218 *ille* operum custos, *illum*[159] *admirantur* et omnes *circumstant. . .stipant*que frequentes, et saepe *attollunt* umeris et corpora bello *obiectant* pulchramque *petunt* per vulnera mortem. In this passage *illum* is used with *admirantur* and *circumstant* and probably with *stipant*[160]; but we must supply *pro illo* with *corpora obiectant*[161], and possibly also with *petunt mortem*, although the latter seems practically independent, as is the relative in the second class cited above (36).

Of this second class we have also several fairly certain examples with demonstrative pronouns.

Thus in E. 8.95–98 *has* herbas atque *haec. . .*venena ipse dedit Moeris. . .; *his*[162] ego saepe lupum *fieri* et se *condere* silvis Moerim ⟨vidi⟩, *his* certainly is not to be joined with *se condere*[163], except perhaps indirectly.

---

[157]Contrast with this G. 2.388–389 *te*, Bacche, vocant . . ., *tibi*que oscilla . . . suspendunt, which is parallel to 11.785–787 (40). Note also the use of *ego. . . mihi* in 10.442 (cited in note 155).

[158]For examples of the repeated demonstrative, corresponding to the examples of the repeated personal pronoun cited in note 157, see 5.412–414 *haec* . . . arma gerebat, . . . *his* . . . stetit, *his* ego suetus, and 10.858–859 *hoc* decus illi, *hoc* solamen erat, bellis *hoc* victor abibat (cited again in note 329). With this repetition of the demonstrative in different cases, we may perhaps compare the commoner repetition of the demonstrative in different genders, seen e.g. in the following examples: E. 8.95 *has* herbas atque *haec* Ponto mihi lecta venena; 5.596 *hunc* morem cursus atque *haec* certamina; 8.185–186 *haec* sollemnia . . ., *has* ex more dapes, *hanc* tanti numinis *aram*; 3.714 *hic* labor extremus, longarum *haec* meta viarum <fuit>; 6.129 *hoc* opus, *hic* labor est; 12.572 *hoc* caput <est> . . ., *haec* belli summa nefandi; 3.558–559 *hic* illa Charybdis: *hos* Helenus scopulos, *haec* saxa horrenda canebat; 7.173–176 *hic* . . . omen erat; *hoc* illis curia templum, *hae* sacris sedes epulis; *hic* . . . soliti patres considere mensis; 7.150–151 *haec* fontis stagna Numici, *hunc* Thybrim fluvium, *hic* fortis habitare Latinos. In the last three instances, we may note the use of the demonstrative adverb in combination with the pronouns; and for this we may compare 1.16–18 *hic* illius arma, *hic* currus fuit; *hoc* regnum dea gentibus esse . . . iam tum tenditque fovetque. With those of the foregoing examples that illustrate the repetition of demonstrative adjectives in different forms, we may compare the instances of the use of the interrogative adjective in different forms cited in note 166.

[159]Note that so far as the use of *ille* and *illum* goes, this example is like those cited in note 158. See also note 162 and note 164.

[160]For the transitive use compare 4.544 manu stipata meorum.

[161]Compare 12.229–230 pro cunctis . . . unam obiectare animam.

[162]For the use of *his* after *has* and *haec*, compare notes 158 and 159: for *has* and *haec*, see especially the second sentence of note 158.

[163]It seems to me that logically, since the point involved is the transformation and not the subsequent concealment in the woods, *se condere* should be subordinated to *fieri* (compare 57 and note 238, and most of the examples under Class II), although exactly the contrary opinion is apparently held by Wagner (Q. V. 34.3), who paraphrases by *lupum factum se condere*. Of course he could say that *his*

In 8.55–56 *hi* bellum adsidue *ducunt* cum gente Latina; *hos*[164] castris adhibe socios et *foedera iunge*, it might be possible to supply *his* or *cum his* with *foedera iunge* and thus reduce this passage to an example of Class I; but I should hesitate to recommend such a treatment, since I can find no Vergilian instance of *foedera iungere* accompanied by any specific indication of those with whom the treaty is made[165]. After the anaphora with the two earlier verbs (*hi* and *hos*, each emphasized by being placed first, both in its clause and in its line), we should naturally expect some form of the demonstrative with *iunge*. C. thinks it was "some one who wished to bring the two clauses under a similar regimen" who introduced the variant reading *foedere* (this reading would give us a passage parallel to 10.105-106, quoted in note 165).

6.100–101 *ea* ⟨= *talia* ⟩ *frena* furenti concutit et *stimulos* sub pectore vertit Apollo belongs here if we accept C's view that we need not supply *eos* with *stimulos*.

Again in 12.856–860 non secus ac nervo per nubem impulsa sagitta . . .stridens et celeris incognita transilit umbras: *talis* se sata Nocte *tulit* terrasque *petivit*, *talis* is appropriate only with *se tulit*, and should not be construed with *terras petivit*, which designates an action not performed by the arrow. (However, we spoil a Vergilian simile if we analyze it so closely.)

The above examples furnish ample testimony that the syntactical peculiarity at present under discussion is by no means confined to passages involving relative pronouns. But the relative construction is either so much more frequent, or, from our point of view at least, so much more anomalous,—perhaps both,—that it is particularly conspicuous, and it will receive special treatment here.

---

modifies *factum*, and it is true that in Latin the participle instead of the main verb may be made to carry the leading thought, but *factum* would constitute a poor *pendant* for *excire* in the next line.

[164]On *hi*. . . *hos* here, compare note 159 on *ille*. . .*illum* in G. 4.215.

[165]The expression occurs in 4.112 miscerive probet populos aut foedera iungi, 7.546 dic in amicitiam coeant et foedera iungant, 8.639–641 idem inter se posito certamine reges . . . stabant et caesa iungebant foedera porca, 12.822 cum iam leges et foedera iungent (in one comparable instance, 10.105–106 Ausonios coniungi foedere Teucris haud licitum, where the names of the peoples concerned are introduced, an altogether different construction is used). Synonymous phrases, also without the designation of the parties to the treaty, are to be found in 10.15 componite foedus, 12.13 concipe foedus (compare 12.158 conceptumque excute foedus), 12.314 ictum iam foedus <est>, 12.316–317 ego foedera faxo firma manu, 11.330–332 qui dicta ferant et foedera firment centum oratores prima de gente Latinos ire placet. With the last examples may be contrasted another passage involving *firmo*, 12.212 talibus inter se firmabant foedera dictis, where a phrase introduced by *inter* indicates those making the treaty. Not dissimilar to the use of *inter* here is that of *cum* in 10.902 nec tecum meus haec pepigit mihi foedera Lausus.

Examples of the regular construction, where a second relative is inserted in the proper case[166], are so rare in comparison with the examples where a second relative is omitted as to seem well-nigh irregular. We may note E. 8.1–4 pastorum . . . , *quos est mirata* iuvenca certantis, *quorum* stupefactae *carmine* lynces, et mutata suos requierunt flumina cursus; 2.5–6 *quae*que ipse miserrima *vidi* et *quorum pars* magna fui; 4.211–213 femina, *quae* . . . urbem exiguam pretio *posuit*, *cui* litus arandum *cui*que loci leges *dedimus*; 5.397–398 mihi *quae* . . . *fuerat quaque* . . . iste *exsultat* . . . iuventas; 6.608–610 hic, *quibus invisi* fratres . . . , aut *qui* divitiis . . . *incubuere*; 7.98–101 externi venient generi, *qui* sanguine nostrum nomen in astra *ferant*, *quorum*que a *stirpe* nepotes omnia sub pedibus . . . vertique regique videbunt; 7.651–654 Lausus, . . . dignus patriis *qui* laetior *esset* imperiis et *cui* pater haud Mezentius *esset*; 8.511–512 tu, *cuius* et *annis* et *generi* fata indulgent, *quem* numina *poscunt*; 10.613–614 si mihi, *quae* quondam *fuerat*, *quam*que *esse debebat*, vis in amore foret; 11.785–787 Apollo, *quem* . . . *colimus*, *cui* pineus ardor . . . *pascitur*; perhaps 11.820–822 Accam, . . . unam, . . . fida ante alias *quae* sola Camillae, *quicum partiri* curas[167]. With these we may perhaps compare 4.247–249 Atlantis duri, caelum *qui* vertice *fulcit*, Atlantis, . . . *cui*. . . caput et vento *pulsatur* et imbri: here the rhetorical repetition of the antecedent, *Atlantis*, makes the insertion of the second relative obligatory. An example with relative adverbs is G. 2.266–267 locum similem exquirunt, *ubi* prima *paretur* arboribus seges et *quo* mox digesta feratur: on this compare note 215.

[166]Compare the examples with personal and demonstrative pronouns cited in notes 157 and 158, respectively. Similar examples with interrogative pronouns are 2.121 (cited on 33) and 10.285–286 secum versat *quos ducere* contra vel *quibus* obsessos possit *concredere* muros; also Seneca, Medea 182, *cui* paret illa *quem*ve securum sinet? Examples with interrogative adjectives, corresponding to the examples with demonstrative adjectives cited in note 158, are 5.474–476 cognoscite . . . et mihi *quae* fuerint . . . vires et *qua* servetis revocatum a morte Dareta, 3.337 tibi *qui* cursum venti, *quae* fata dedere?, and 9.399–400 (cited in note 61). An example with relative adjectives is 9.269–270 (16). It may be observed that in 2.121, 3.337, 9.269–270, and 9.399–400 there is no conjunction. This is true also of some of the passages illustrating the corresponding use of demonstrative pronouns (see note 158) and of relative pronouns (see this page). The employment of the same pronoun in different cases serves as a sort of 'connective variant repetition' (see note 551). Compare, too, the omission of a connective before the interrogative clauses in 11.249–250, E. 3.41–42, G. 2.477–482, and 1.742–746 (cited on page 94).

[167]For *fida* Ribbeck and H. read *fidam*. They insert a comma after *alias*, and H. omits the comma after *Camillae*, though Ribbeck, following the German method of pointing, retains it. As a result of these changes, the second relative clause is made subordinate to, not coordinate with, the first. But this reading seems to me less Vergilian than the other: *sola Camillae quicum partiri curas* in particular appears to me to have an awkward and choppy effect, quite different from the poet's usual grace and smooth fluency. Such choppiness might not be without its effectiveness under certain circumstances, such as prevail, for instance, in 6.179–182 (see 19) and in 9.813–814 (see note 307); but it is quite out

(1) Demonstrative Pronoun in Second Clause instead of Second Relative

A special peculiarity occurs in instances where Vergil does employ a second pronoun in the proper case, but a demonstrative, not a relative[168]—the ordinary Greek usage[169], by the way. Such a usage is

---

of place in a passage dealing with Camilla and her band of maidens, whom Vergil treats with such tender grace and delicacy. Compare the similar comments on other passages made at the end of note 181 and in note 642.

[168]We have one instance of which it might be possible to say that an intensive pronoun replaces the demonstrative. This is 12.225–226 *cui* genus a proavis ingens clarumque paternae nomen erat virtutis, et *ipse* acerrimus armis. But for an interpretation that seems to me preferable, see below, 137. In 12.261–263 o miseri, quos . . . advena . . . territat . . ., et litora *vestra* vi populat, we have a similar use of a possessive: see below, 57. Also in 4.251 the noun *senis* is really a vivid substitute for the pronoun *eius*: see below, 66.

[169]See Goodwin, § 1040. In Latin we find this use "almost confined to early Latin, Lucretius, and Cicero", according to G.-L., § 636, Note 1. So, too, Lane, § 1833 c. Examples taken from every period of the language, including one from Vergil, 7.59–63 (for which see below, 43), are cited in Stolz-Schmalz[5], pages 714–715. For a more extended discussion of this usage in Latin, see Johan Nicolai Madvig, Opuscula Altera, 178 (Copenhagen, privately printed, 1842), and Munro on Lucretius 1.720. Examples from Cicero are given by Madvig, examples from both Cicero and Lucretius by Munro. I have noted an example in Ovid, Metamorphoses 10.644–647 est ager, . . . telluris Cypriae pars optima, *quam* mihi prisci sacravere senes, templisque accedere dotem *hanc* iussere meis. Examples from Livy are collected by Ernst Wilhelm Fabri on 21.46.10 in his edition of Books 21–22 (revised by Heinrich Wilhelm Heerwagen, Nuremberg, Johann Leonhard Schrag, 1852) and on 23.8.3 and 24.11.7 in his edition of Books 23–24 (Nuremberg, Johann Leonhard Schrag, 1840); and Fabri's collection is referred to and commented on by Ludwig Kühnast in Die Hauptpunkte der Livianischen Syntax, 58–59 (Berlin, W. Weber, 1872). But it must be remarked that both Fabri and Kühnast at times fall into a sort of confusion referred to by Madvig (178) in that they fail to distinguish between instances in which the relative pronoun is replaced in a second clause by a demonstrative (the type under discussion here, and illustrated from Vergil on 43–47), and those in which a pronoun in the second clause has to be supplied (the type that I call Class I, and illustrate on 47–58). Madvig himself is not quite clear in regard to the distinction between these two types. Thus he would assign to the first of them an example which to my mind belongs to the second, namely Cicero, In Verrem 4.9 mancipium putarunt, *quo* et omnes *utimur* et non *praebetur* a populo. He explains (178) that we should supply as a subject for *praebetur* not *quod* but *id*, and he recasts the clause as follows, *nec id praebetur a populo*. I am well aware that neither *et quod non praebetur* nor *nec quod praebetur* is idiomatic Latin (compare for the latter note 189). But from the point of view of strict logic, a theoretical expansion demands *quod*. On the other hand *id* suits neither the exigencies of logic nor those of idiom. From the point of view of Latin, it is wholly unnecessary, though from that of German or English, the verb demands as subject some pronoun, demonstrative or personal—and *id* can be counted as either. (Compare above, 14–15, on E. 3.8–9.)

In the corresponding usage in English, a personal pronoun is substituted for the second relative. I am inclined to believe that this is rare; at all events the instances of it that I have observed present a distinctly odd and rather awkward effect. I have noted five examples. The least harsh is from Charles Dickens, The Pickwick Papers, chapter 40, ". . . a queer sort of gentleman, *who* seemed made for the vehicle, and the vehicle for *him*": here the close parallelism of the relative and the non-relative clauses serves to soften the harshness of the construction. A second example is from Harold North Fowler and James Rignall Wheeler, A Handbook of Greek Archaeology, 516 (New York, American Book

perhaps justified by the ancient view of the relative, which certainly seems to have been considered as much a coordinating as a subordinating connective. As proofs that such a view existed, we may cite for Latin[170] the very common use of the so-called connecting relative[171] at the beginning of a sentence logically independent; the occasional employment in indirect discourse of an infinitive—proper only in main clauses—after a relative[172]; and two[173] very interesting examples in Vergil, 3.304–305 ad tumulum, viridi *quem* caespite inanem et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacraverat *aras*, and 12.845–847 Dirae, *quas* et Tartaream Nox intempesta *Megaeram* uno eodemque tulit partu, where the relatives, *quem* and *quas*, are actually made coordinate with the nouns *aras* and *Megaeram*, respectively[174]—a construction which seems strange to us[175], although there would be nothing odd about *et eum et aras sacraverat* or *et eas et Megaeram tulit*.

Company, 1909): ". . . large *amphorae* and *craters*, *which* are not only striking specimens of ceramic art because of the rich effect of their decoration, but *they* are very noteworthy also for the interesting nature of the subjects represented upon them." A third is from an unsigned review of Rainbow Valley, by L. M. Montgomery, in The New York Times Book Review, September 21, 1919, 484: "There are also some new people *whom* the neighborhood takes into its arms and at once begins, after its friendly fashion, to arrange *their* lives and futures." A fourth is from a short story by Nathan Asch, Gertrude Donovan, included in The Best Short Stories of 1925, edited by Edward J. O'Brien, 45 (Boston, Small, Maynard and Company, 1926): ". . . they would seek something *which* they did not understand, and did not know where to find *it*." The last is from Henry Sydnor Harrison, Saint Teresa,120 (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922): "This girl was not of those he had rolled hoops with in Washington Square in the later eighties, and had lived to dance at *their* diverse weddings." This example is especially peculiar in that no relative appears in it at all; but one is clearly to be supplied as the object of the preposition *with*. A less colloquial substitute for the clause *he had rolled hoops with* would be *with whom he had rolled hoops*. (Of course all italics in these quotations are mine.)

[170]In Greek we may recall the close relation, both morphological and syntactical, existing between the relative and the demonstrative.

[171]For examples see 4.90 (cited on page 56), 6.158–159 (cited on page 60), and 9.347 (cited on pages 46–47). See also the comment (43) on the use of *quam* in 7.61.

[172]See G.-L. § 635.

[173]To these we must add a third example, G. 1.343–344 Cererem pubes . . . adoret: *cui* tu lacte favos et miti dilue *Baccho*, if we accept the interpretation mentioned by Servius, which joins *cui* and *Baccho*. It is tempting thus to couple these two vegetation divinities, who are named together also in E. 5.79 Baccho Cererique (cited by C.) and in G. 1.7 Liber et alma Ceres, where, as here, one is distinguished by an adjectival epithet. But that very epithet in the present instance rather militates against the pairing of the deities, since, as C. says, *mili* is a strong argument in favor of coupling *lacte* and *Baccho*, i. e. *vino*. However, it cannot be denied that it is misleading on Vergil's part to use the name of a god by metonymy directly after using the name of another divinity in a literal sense.

[174]Compare Euripides, Electra 85–87 ὑπ' Αἰγίσθου παθών, ὅς μου κατέκτα πατέρα χἠ πανώλεθρος μήτηρ, where the relative ὅς is made coordinate with ἡ . . . μήτηρ.

[175]But I have noted a few examples of it in English, as follows: (1) in William Stearns Davis, A Victor of Salamis, 242 (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1911), "the ivory throne, around *which* and *him* that sat thereon . . . glittered the Persian grandees" (possibly the author is consciously imitating the classical style, since he uses rather stilted language throughout); (2) in Owen Johnson.

Thus the Latin can say (7.59–63) laurus erat. . . , *quam* pater . . .ipse ferebatur Phoebo *sacrasse* Latinus, Laurentisque *ab ea* nomen posuisse colonis. This from our point of view is a fusion of *laurus erat, quam pater ferebatur sacrasse, a quaque* [176] *Laurentis nomen posuisse colonis* and *laurus erat, (et) eam pater ferebatur sacrasse, Laurentisque ab ea nomen posuisse colonis*. Perhaps this fusion is less obvious from the Roman point of view, in accordance with which *quam* was probably felt as equivalent to *et eam*[177].

A parallel example is G. 1.199–203 sic omnia fatis in peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri, non aliter quam *qui* adverso vix flumine lembum remigiis *subigit*, si bracchia forte remisit, atque *illum* in praeceps prono *rapit* alveus amni[178]. I think that this means logically, 'non aliter quam is sublapsus refertur, qui adverso vix flumine lembum remigiis subigit (si bracchia forte remisit), atque[179] *quem* in praeceps

---

The Varmint, 28 (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1926), "he was face to face with a human being between *whom* and *himself* there could never be a question of compromise or quarter"; (3) in Charles Dickens, The Pickwick Papers, last paragraph, "the faithful Sam, between *whom* and *his master* there exists a steady and reciprocal attachment"; (4) in J. M. Barrie, The Little White Bird, 28 (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), "<a> street between *which* and *mine* are little yards"; (5) in George Macdonald, The Princess and the Goblin, 84 (New York, A. L. Burt, no date), "a farther part of the mountain, between *which* and the *mine* there was as yet no communication"; (6) in Gertrude Atherton, The Immortal Marriage, 84 (New York, Boni and Liveright, 1927), "Aspasia . . . discoursed . . . on the rationalism of Xenophanes, . . . to *whose* teachings and to those *of his disciple Parmenides* the Hellenes owed their deliverance from the dangers of the Orphic cult". Not altogether dissimilar in effect produced is a sentence from The New York Times Book Review and Magazine, December 11, 1921, 20, under the head Books and Authors, in which the anonymous author coordinates a noun modified by a relative pronoun, and another noun not so modified: "Marshal Foch wrote the following letter to General Greely, *whose son* and *Major Colton* were translating this work". Finally I should like to cite an instance in which a relative (*as=which*) is made parallel with an adjective. This occurs in C's. note on E. 1.69: "the soldiers being supposed to be bad farmers, *as* in fact they were, and therefore always *ready* for new civil wars". The phrase *ready for new civil wars* is certainly interjected by C. in his own person, and therefore must be coordinated with *as in fact they were;* it cannot be taken as parallel with *bad farmers*, for nothing is being "supposed" about the soldiers' readiness for war. The fact that the phrase *and . . . wars* has absolutely nothing to do with the point under discussion intensifies the awkwardness of its introduction. It may be noted that Haverfield in his revision omits the words in question. For other specimens of C's. tendency to employ relative constructions illogically, see note 247.

[176] An ugly and ungainly expression, by the way, and ambiguous as well.

[177] Compare 42 and note 171.

[178] An abstract of my views with respect to this passage appears in Proceedings of the American Philological Association 54 (1923), xix.

[179] We may safely follow C. in dismissing the view expressed by Aulus Gellius, 10.29 (C's. "9.29" is an error), that *atque* is not a connective here, but an adverb synonymous with *statim*. Psychologically, the force of *atque* approaches that of *statim* in such examples as E. 7.7 and 4.663 (cited on 25–26); but grammatically, an adverb and a conjunction cannot possibly be interchangeable, and the examples cited by Gellius do not justify him in his view that *atque* is not always a conjunction.

prono rapit alveus amni'. I have not seen this precise explanation given anywhere, although it is doubtless one of those "several other views" which C. says "have been or might be suggested, with more or less plausibility", but which he dismisses on the ground that "none of them, however, seems to have any real likelihood" as against the one which he himself adopts. The only objection that I can find to my explanation is in the slightly illogical position of the *si* clause, which, if the following clause (line 203) is to form part of the passage at all, ought to be connected syntactically with the verb in this clause, *rapit*, rather than with the preceding verb, *subigit*. I think there is a sort of fusion here. Vergil might well have said, *non aliter quam (is retro sublapsus refertur) qui adverso vix flumine lembum remigiis subigit, si bracchia forte remisit*, and stopped there. Quite obviously, granted the condition *si bracchia forte remisit*, the drifting downstream will result. But he chose to add another verse, to heighten the vividness and the precision of his picture; and that verse being what it is, he ought to have said, *non aliter quam (is retro sublapsus refertur) qui adverso vix flumine lembum remigiis subigit, atque quem, si bracchia forte remisit, in praeceps prono rapit alveus amni*[180]. However, even though he adds the new verse, he leaves the preceding one as it was, regardless of the slight misplacement of the *si* clause involved in this confusion[181]. We may compare the not dis-

---

[180]The *subigit* clause is now no longer an essential part of the picture; and it would be more logical, though far more unwieldy and doubtless far less Vergilian, to say something of this sort: *non aliter quam (is retro sublapsus refertur) quem (cum adverso vix flumine lembum remigiis subegerit), si bracchia forte remisit, in praeceps prono rapit alveus amni*. Obviously, this is out of the question; and perhaps the use of *atque*, emphasizing as it does the member that follows it, sufficiently subordinates the clause preceding it.

[181]According to my view, *qui . . . subigit*, as the order surely suggests, is the subject not of *remisit* but of an understood *retro sublapsus refertur*. This is C's. view also. Yet in support of it he adduces two passages that are not at all pertinent, namely 4.668–671 resonat magnis plangoribus aether, non aliter quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes . . . volvantur, and 8.242–246 patuere cavernae, non secus ac si . . . terra dehiscens infernas reseret sedes et regna recludat . . ., superque immane barathrum cernatur, trepidentque. . . Manes. C. does not seem to note several important differences: in both these passages we have a genuine conditional clause of comparison, *quam si* or *ac si* used in *immediate* conjunction, and followed by the *subjunctive*; and the apodosis to be supplied is (except for mood and perhaps for tense) *identical* with the words that precede the simile, *resonet magnis plangoribus aether* in the one case, *pateant cavernae* in the other; whereas in G. 1.199–203 we cannot supply *omnia retro sublapsa referuntur* or its representative *fit*, but, as C. sees himself, we must supply the highly specialized *retro sublapsus refertur*. Kennedy and Page, though they do not compare these other passages, yet come nearer to them. Kennedy paraphrases as follows: "non aliter quam (fit), si forte (is), qui lembum vix subigit remigiis adverso flumine, bracchia remisit, atque illum (lembum) alveus prono amni in praeceps rapit". P's. interpretation is virtually a translation of this paraphrase of Kennedy's: "not otherwise than (happens) if he who with difficulty forces his bark against the stream has by chance relaxed his arms, and

similar misplacement of the *nam* clause in G. 3.154–156: on this see note 799.

---

at once the channel hurries it headlong away down the stream". But, if we stop to analyze closely, we shall realize that this, too, is illogical, for it would involve just that weakness that C. dodges, since it makes us say that if the man stops rowing, *everything* goes backward. Perhaps it may be argued that in a Vergilian simile, we ought not to analyze so closely; but that is just what Kennedy, quoted with approval by P., proceeds to do, in saying, "the comparison is between the seed which retrogrades when man does not select, and the boat which retrogrades when man does not pull". This is splitting hairs too fine; a Vergilian simile is not so precise, its parts are not so mathematically parallel, as that (compare page 39 on 12.856–860).

Kennedy's explanation is offered in support of his view that *illum* refers to the boat. N., according to Haverfield, entertained the view that *illum* refers to the rower, while the boat is designated by *alveus*. Of such an interpretation P. says: "To take *illum* = 'the rower' and *alveus* = 'the boat' is very unnatural when the boat has just been called *lembus*." But even if *illum* stands for the rower, cannot *alveus* mean the channel? Of course the channel does not hurry the *man* headlong down the stream *directly*; he is in his boat; but the vehicle can readily be ignored. Just so the Tiber in 8.57 says to Aeneas, "ipse ego *te* ripis et recto flumine ducam"; it would be ridiculous to make him say "te navi ducam" or "navem tuam ducam"! And the two possibilities of conduct, namely, by water and by boat, are united in 2.179 quod pelago et . . . avexere carinis, for which see 7-8.

C., too, thinks that " 'Illum' is doubtless the 'lembus' which is distinguished from the rower. So in Catull. 65.23, the original of the present line . . ., 'Atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,' 'illud' is contrasted with 'huic.'" It seems to me that C. considerably weakens his own case by this reference to Catullus, as may be seen if we glance at the entire passage, 65.19–24:

> ut missum sponsi furtivo munere malum
> procurrit casto virginis e gremio,
> quod miserae oblitae molli sub veste locatum,
> dum adventu matris prosilit, excutitur:
> atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,
> huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor.

There is nothing in Vergil's verses to correspond to *huic* in those of Catullus; but there is something which very closely balances *quod* just above, and that is *qui*—the very *qui* that C. seems to think is "contrasted" with *illum*. There is really a decided parallelism between Vergil's <*is*> *qui* . . . *subigit* <*refertur*>, following *non aliter quam*, and Catullus's *missum* . . . *malum* . . . *quod* . . . *excutitur*, following *ut*. Since in Catullus *quod* and *illud* refer to the same object, namely the apple, the passage, if it proves anything at all, is an argument for concluding that in Vergil *qui* and *illum* likewise refer to the same object, namely the rower.

C. further adds of the view that *illum* refers to the rower that "the imitations in Sen. Ag. 497, Hipp. 182, Thy. 438 (quoted by Cerda), look the other way". The passage from Agamemnon has no direct bearing on the case. Cerda cites Agamemnon 499–500 (not 497), together with Agamemnon 260 and "Hippolytus" (i. e. Phaedra) 179, to illustrate the phrase *in praeceps* in G. 1.203. These passages run as follows: Agamemnon 499–500 illam dehiscens pontus in praeceps rapit hauritque; Agamemnon 260 Aegisthe, quid me rursus in praeceps agis. . . ?; Phaedra 179 vadit animus in praeceps sciens. It is true that *illam* in Agamemnon 499 is a better parallel for *illum* in G. 3.203 if the latter refers to the boat, not the rower; but there is no particular reason why the two *should* be parallel. The situations are quite different, and the similarities are merely verbal. In the passage in Seneca, there is for the moment no question of the seamen, nor, for that matter, of an individual ship. The antecedent of *illam* is *classis* (used in the sense of 'fleet') in the preceding sentence, 497–498 ipsa se classis premit et prora prorae nocuit et lateri latus. The other two passages that C. credits Cerda

Ille—i.e. *et ille*—replaces *et qui* in 9.344–350 subit. . .Rhoetum. . . , pectore in adverso totum *cui* comminus ensem *condidit* adsurgenti, et

---

with quoting are more pertinent. These are cited by Cerda to illustrate not a single phrase but the whole comparison. In each instance Cerda gives merely a part, Phaedra 181–183 and Thyestes 437–439; but a complete understanding of the passages demands the inclusion of the full statement that gave rise to these similes,and accordingly I shall quote at greater length. The two passages are as follows: Phaedra 179–183

> . . . vadit animus in praeceps sciens
> remeatque frustra sana consilia appetens.
> sic cum gravatam navita adversa ratem
> propellit unda, cedit in vanum labor
> et victa prono puppis aufertur vado;

and Thyestes 436–439

> placet ire, pigris membra sed genibus labant
> alioque quam quo nitor abductus feror.
> sic concitatam remige et velo ratem
> aestus resistens remigi et velo refert.

The passage from Thyestes,though it has some bearing on the case,still seems to me rather remote; but the one from Phaedra is so like Vergil's lines that there can be little if any doubt of its being an echo thereof. Note 179 *in praeceps* (already mentioned as a verbal parallel); 180 *remeat*, which is far more like Vergil's *retro . . . referri* (200) than is *alio . . . feror* in Thyestes 437; 181 *adversa*, suggesting Vergil's *adverso . . . flumine* (201); 183 *prono*. The most significant point of all is the reference in *navita* (181) to the rower, who is not directly and specifically mentioned elsewhere. So in this one instance the evidence afforded by a parallel passage certainly does point toward the view that *illum* stands for the boat. But, granted that such evidence has any weight, is it not counterbalanced by that provided by the passage from Catullus,as pointed out in the preceding paragraph? Vergil's model seems to me more important as evidence than Vergil's imitator. Vergil had a straightforward passage to copy; Seneca, an ambiguous one. Moreover, we must question whether such evidence *has* much weight. Such testimony as that afforded in note 1138, where are collected a group of instances in which Vergil, whether intentionally or inadvertently, departed in some detail from his Greek models, should make us wary in this respect. In the first place, we have no reason to suppose that Seneca, in copying Vergil, is copying him in every detail. He chooses to use the noun *puppis* instead of an inconclusive pronoun as Vergil did. His noun does not necessarily correspond to the antecedent of Vergil's pronoun. And in the second place, even if we admit that Seneca is unwilling to depart from Vergil in any point, need we conclude that he must have understood Vergil in every point? The present question does not demand a minute feeling for Latin style or idiom; if it did, I should be willing to accept Seneca's opinion as worth more than my own, or, indeed, than any modern scholar's. But it is a question of personal interpretation, of individual judgment; and here there is no reason to rank Seneca higher than any discriminating and scholarly critic of our own day. (I am glad to note that my view with regard to the danger of interpreting in the light of parallel passages by imitators coincides with that expressed by Professor Knapp in The School Review 13.505–506, in the course of the article cited above, note 16.)

Finally, it may be noted that both Kennedy and C. couple *remisit* and *rapit*, not *subigit* and *rapit*, as my view does. But the present *subigit* seems to me to form a better coordinate with *rapit* than does the perfect *remisit*. Moreover, if we recognize two coordinate *si* clauses of which one (the *remisit* clause) has the same subject as the *subigit* clause, and the second (the *rapit* clause) a different subject (*alveus*), we get a distinctly jerky effect very different from Vergil's customary smoothness, so much to be desired here above all, since we may well expect to find the unchecked floating of the boat reflected in the unimpeded flow of the poet's words (compare notes 167 and 642).

multa morte *recepit*;[182] purpuream *vomit ille* animam et cum sanguine mixta vina refert moriens; hic furto fervidus instat. Here the lack of perfect balance is scarcely perceptible, for two reasons: (1) *cui* in 347 itself = *et illi*, since it is a connecting relative[183]; (2) *ille* is balanced by the following *hic*—the contrast thus produced would have been regrettably lost had the demands of strict logic been met.

Illum—i.e. *sed illum*—logically = *sed quem*[184] in 12.348–352 parentem, *qui*. . .ausus Pelidae pretium sibi poscere currus; *illum* Tydides alio. . .*adfecit* pretio nec equis aspirat Achilli[185].

In the same way *ille* = *sed ille* = *sed qui*[186] in 12.391–397 iamque aderat. . .Iapyx Iasides, . . .*cui*. . .Apollo augurium citharamque *dabat* celerisque sagittas; *ille*. . .scire potestates herbarum usumque medendi *maluit*. Here both N. and H. use a period before *ille*, but surely logic demands rather a semicolon or a colon[187].

In G. 2.185–188 campus (*qualem* saepe cava montis convalle solemus *dispicere*: *huc* summis liquuntur rupibus amnes felicemque trahunt limum) the use of the demonstrative adverb *huc* where, as C. says, strict logic demands the relative adverb *quo*, is somewhat similar; but it is not precisely so, since in the relative *quo* clause required by logic, *quo* would be subordinate to, not coordinate with, the preceding *qualem* clause. Possibly a simpler way to account for the anomaly would be to regard *huc*. . .*limum* as an additional parenthetical clause within the clause, itself already parenthetical, *qualem* . . .*limum*. We might indicate this by setting off *qualem*. . .*limum* with dashes (as C. and P. do, while H. uses parentheses) and in addition by enclosing *huc*. . .*limum* within parentheses.

(2) Relative Pronoun Understood in Second Clause

Much more often than he inserts a demonstrative pronoun where strict logic demands a relative, Vergil omits the relative altogether (Class I).

[182]This is K's. punctuation. H. (who reads *purpureum*) has a colon before *vomit*. If we follow C's. pointing and use a period after *recepit* instead of a shorter stop, the inconcinnity (slight in any case, as is said) practically disappears. Compare the comment of Kühnast, 59 (cited in note 169), ". . . dass es öfters von der Interpunction abhängt, ob dieser Grācismus stattfindet".

[183]This becomes clearer if, instead of the comma which I have used before *pectore* (the stop employed by K. also), we place there either a colon (so C.) or a period (so H.). On the connecting relative, see 42 and note 171.

[184]A combination which apparently, except under very special circumstances, is not possible in Latin. See G.-L., §636, Note 2. It must be noted that in the analyses which follow, Latin idiom is frequently violated—just as English idiom doubtless would be if we essayed a similar analysis in the vernacular. Logic and idiom are often non-commensurable quantities.

[185]Note that if we use *quem* with *adfecit* we need *qui* with *aspirat*. Compare 48. [186]Compare note 184. [187]Compare note 182.

(a) A Nominative Pronoun to Be Supplied

1'. *AFTER AN ACCUSATIVE*

The omission of the relative pronoun seems most easily accounted for when the relative would, if expressed, be in the nominative case, since a personal pronoun in this case would be quite naturally and regularly omitted[188]. Thus we may regard 5.781–784 Iunonis gravis ira neque exsaturabile pectus. . . , *quam* nec longa dies pietas nec *mitigat* ulla, nec Iovis imperio fatisque infracta *quiescit* as a fusion of *Iunonis quam nec dies pietas nec mitigat ulla, nec*[189] *quae quiescit* and *eam*(=*Iunonem*) *nec dies pietas nec mitigat ulla, nec quiescit* (*ea* as subject of *quiescit* is of course unnecessary).

Another example where, at least from our point of view, a second relative in the nominative is to be supplied after an accusative is 11.306–307 viris. . . , *quos* nulla *fatigant* proelia nec victi possunt absistere ferro. Supply *qui*[190]. The inconcinnity here Ribbeck obviates, or at least renders less obvious, by inserting a colon after *proelia*—a method of punctuating, however, which C., with apparent justice, dismisses as "gratuitous and improbable".

In 11.364–365 ego, invisum *quem* tu tibi *fingis*, et esse nil moror, we are perhaps to supply *qui*[191]. H. solves the difficulty here by enclosing *et esse nil moror* in parentheses. C. uses dashes in his Translation, though not in his Edition. He renders the passage thus, "I, whom you give out to be your enemy—and I care not though I be—"[192].

2'. *AFTER A DATIVE*

In several instances a nominative is to be supplied from a dative.

In G. 4.165–168 sunt *quibus* ad portas cecidit custodia sorti, inque vicem *speculantur* aquas et nubila caeli, aut onera *accipiunt* venientum, aut. . .fucos. . .a praesepibus *arcent*, we supply *qui* with *speculantur*, *accipiunt*, and *arcent*[193]. P. apparently makes these verbs

[188]Compare 14–15 on E. 3.8–9. Also compare 12.351–352 (47 and note 185), and the second of the English sentences listed in note 169.

[189]This form is purely theoretical (compare note 184). The use of *nec* with the relative seems to be contrary to Latin idiom: on this compare Madvig (cited in note 169), 178. Doubtless the use of *nec* shows how unconscious the Roman writer was of the need, felt by us, of a second relative.

[190]Here again we should have the peculiar *nec* plus a relative. Compare note 189.

[191]We might regard *quem* as the subject of *esse*; but the sense seems rather to call for *qui*.

[192]Compare 74.

[193]It should be noted that these verbs are not strictly parallel in their relation with *cecidit*, with which *speculantur*, joined thereto by the practically epexegetical *-que*, is in much closer connection than is *accipiunt* or *arcent*, joined thereto by *aut*. This closer connection is due to the fact that *qui* with *speculantur* refers to the same group as *quibus* (with *cecidit*), whereas *qui* with *accipiunt* and *qui* with *arcent* refer to different groups. This is made clearer if, while supplying simply *qui* with *speculantur*, we supply *sunt qui* (as does C.) with *accipiunt* and *arcent*;

parallel with *sunt* rather than with *cecidit*, but this seems less logical[194], although we might say that *sunt quibus* is virtually equivalent to *aliquibus*[195].

In 8.563–566 Erulum. . . , nascenti *cui* tris animas Feronia mater . . .*dederat*, terna arma movenda, ter leto *sternendus erat*, we supply *qui* with *sternendus erat*[196].

In 9.592–594 Numanum, *cui* Remulo cognomen *erat*, Turnique minorem germanam nuper thalamo sociatus *habebat*[197], we supply *qui* with *habebat*.

In 8.315–318 gensque. . . , *quis* neque mos neque cultus *erat*, nec iungere tauros aut componere opes *norant* aut parcere parto, sed rami atque asper victu venatus *alebat*, we supply the nominative *qui* with *norant*. We must also supply the accusative *quos* with *alebat*. This last point brings us to the next category.

(b) An Accusative Pronoun to Be Supplied

After the cases where a nominative relative must be supplied, perhaps those requiring an accusative rank in simplicity.

---

but in this case we should need mentally to alter *aut* to *et*, or else, more clumsily, insert *et* before *sunt qui*, and regard the first *aut* as merely correlative, not connective. P's. view of the interrelationship of these verbs is wholly different: he makes all three perfectly parallel, believing that "in line 165 the large division of those who 'keep ward' at the gates is mentioned", while "in 166–168 the *subdivisions* of these warders are described". But this seems far less plausible, since, though the warders might conceivably act as soldiers on occasion (*arcent*), it appears hardly likely that they would relax their vigilance in order to relieve their returning comrades of their burden (*accipiunt*). Or are we to suppose that all the functions indicated, perhaps performed in turn (*in. . .vicem*), are included in the *custodia* at the door?

[194]See note 193.

[195]Parallel, according to P., to *aliae*, *pars*, *aliae*, and *aliae* in lines 158, 159, 162, and 163 respectively.

[196]Concerning *terna arma movenda*, I am very much in the dark. It may be (1) an accusative parallel with *tris animas*. We may conclude from their punctuation that this is the view of C. and H., since they use only a comma before it, while they set off the following clause, C. by a semicolon and H. by a parenthesis. For a further discussion of the passage in the light of this view, see note 964. Or it may be (2) a clause parallel with *ter leto sternendus erat*, as the repetition of the gerundive would suggest. In that case what relative shall we supply to introduce it? Servius says the idea is " 'movenda' . . . vel contra ipsum, vel ab ipso". If *ab ipso*, why not *ipsi*, dative of separation? (I assume that separation is meant here, not agency; for if the idea were that the arms were to be moved three times *by* him, the gerundive would be out of place, as we should need an expression of potentiality, not of necessity.) Then the relative *cui* can carry through with both verbs. Otherwise we must supply *contra quem*. But in view of the following clause, 566–567 (see 51), this interpretation seems to me far less plausible: *exuit armis* there corresponds to *terna arma movenda* just as *abstulit . . .animas* does to *tris animas*. Possibly by its very ambiguity, the expression *terna arma movenda*, which may be either a noun phrase (of the '*ab urbe condita*' type) or a clause (*erant* to be supplied with *movenda*), is made effective as a means of transition from the noun phrase *tris animas* to the clause *ter leto sternendus erat*. Compare page 136 on 12.319–322, and see note 441.

[197]Possibly 12.225–226 should be classed here also. On this see 137.

1'. *AFTER A NOMINATIVE*

The shift from nominative to accusative is relatively simple, as the reverse of that from accusative to nominative cited above[198]. However, I find only one example of it, and that not absolutely certain: 9.387–388 locos *qui* post Albae de nomine *dicti* Albani, tum rex stabula alta Latinus *habebat*. Perhaps the relative to be supplied here is *quos*, though it might also be the adverb *ubi*[199]. Here again, as in G. 2.187–188[200], perhaps the simplest way is to treat the clause in question as parenthetical[201], as is undoubtedly the *tum* clause in 8.99–100[202] tecta vident, *quae* nunc Romana potentia caelo *aequavit*, tum res inopes Euandrus *habebat*[203], cited by C. as a parallel[204]. Still, this parenthetical use of the two *tum* clauses to balance relative clauses—the one with *post* and the other with *nunc*—is in itself not strictly logical[205]. There is an additional lack of logic in the last example inasmuch as the *tecta quae nunc Romana potentia caelo aequavit* are not the same *tecta* as those seen by Aeneas and his comrades[206].

2'. *AFTER A DATIVE*

Frequently we must supply an accusative from a dative.

Perhaps G. 3.147–148 volitans, *cui* nomen asilo Romanum *est*, oestrum Grai *vertere vocantes* belongs here. It seems that we might supply *quem*[207] with *vocantes*[208]—possibly also with *vertere*, by virtue of

---

[198]See 48.

[199]Compare note 215.

[200]See 47. See also 48 on 11.364–365, and note 342 (close) on 12.206–211.

[201]K. and H. so punctuate.

[202]Yet oddly enough in this case H. does *not* use parentheses.

[203]This instance, where no second relative at all can be supplied, of course belongs to Class II, not I (compare 36).

[204]On the other hand, in still another very similar example, 12.134–135 e summo, *qui* nunc Albanus *habetur*—tum neque nomen erat neque honos aut gloria monti (on which see below, 53), we are perhaps to supply *cui*, although it might well be said that the noun *monti*, repeating as it does the idea of the word *summo*, obviates the need of any grammatical connective. Compare note 228.

[205]Compare with this use of a parenthesis introduced by a correlative, that of a parenthesis introduced by a connective, referred to below, 67–77.

[206]Either *tecta vident* alone, or *tecta quae . . . aequavit* alone, would be quite logical. The difficulty lies in Vergil's having made one and the same group of *tecta* common to the two clauses, though actually two completely different groups are involved. Compare 77–78 and note 310.

[207]Just as we supply *quem* (or, by attraction, *quam*) in 1.530 est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt. Compare also Ovid's imitation, Metamorphoses 10.644 est ager, indigenae Tamasenum nomine dicunt. Ennius, in the line that served Vergil as a model, Annales 23 (Vahlen²) est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant, expresses the relative.

[208]Compare E. 5.13–14 haec, . . . quae . . . carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notavi, where *quae* seems to belong at once to a verb (*descripsi*) and to a participle (*modulans*) if P. and C. are correct in their interpretation, which makes the lines stand for *quae carmina descripsi et modulavi, alterna notans*. I have met

the extremely common confusion of an object and its name, although *id* (i.e. *nomen*) would be more logical here. Or conversely, we might choose *quod* (with *nomen*) for our relative, and supply the demonstrative *eum* (i.e. *volitantem*) with *vocantes*. In this case the second relative is no longer coordinate with the first, and the irregularity falls under Class II instead of under Class I. But there is also the possibility of carrying over *cui nomen*, or, perhaps more naturally, *cuius nomen* derived from this, with *vertere* (*eum* is then needed with *vocantes*). The whole structure is somewhat loose.

A certain example is 2.70–72 mihi. . . , *cui* neque apud Danaos usquam locus ⟨*est*⟩, et super ipsi Dardanidae infensi poenas cum sanguine *poscunt*. We supply *quem* with *poscunt*[209].

In 6.215–217 pyram, *cui* frondibus atris *intexunt* latera et feralis ante cupressos *constituunt*, *decorant*que super fulgentibus armis, we supply *quam* with *decorant*. The second clause is without a relative at all, and therefore belongs below, in Class II, unless we supply *quam* with *ante*[210]; but this seems unnecessary even if, with Heyne, we take *ante* locally[211]; and of course it is impossible if we take it temporally, as C. seems to prefer. The word-order, too, with *ante* postponed, militates against this view.

In 8.315–318 gensque. . . , *quis* neque mos neque cultus *erat*, . . .sed rami atque asper victu venatus *alebat*, we supply *quos* with *alebat*, as has already been pointed out above (49).

In 8.566–567 ⟨Erulum⟩ *cui*. . .omnis *abstulit* haec animas dextra et totidem *exuit* armis, we supply *quem* with *exuit*[212].

In 11.642–643 Herminium, nudo *cui* vertice fulva caesaries nudique umeri, nec vulnera *terrent*, we supply *quem* with *terrent*[213].

---

a not dissimilar example in English, in which the relative is used twice over, once with a verb and once with a participle: "This American system, *which* Europe must emulate or lacking *which* must risk cultural subjugation, has a record of brilliant material achievements." The passage quoted is found in New York Herald Tribune Books, December 23, 1928, page 11, in a review called Delirious with Prophecy, by Robert A. Wade.

[209]For the double accusative with *posco* in Vergil, see G. 3.456 meliora deos . . . omnia <or omina> poscens, 4.50 posce deos veniam, 9.71 sociosque incendia poscit, 11.362 pacem te poscimus. Compare *reposco* with two accusatives, 2.139 (quoted on 55), and 7.606 Parthosque reposcere signa.

[210]There is also the possibility that *constituunt* and *decorant* are parallel not with the verb of the relative clause, but with the preceding *struxere*. However, the order of the words and the tenses of the verbs seem distinctly against this.

[211]In that case it seems better to regard it as an adverb like *super* in the following line.

[212]Compare the preceding lines and the comment thereon, 49 and note 196.

[213]Compare note 189.

I can see no reason for enclosing *nec vulnera terrent* in parentheses, as H. does. If he is right, however, the example belongs below, 74.

G. 2.372–375 frons . . . *cui* . . . uri . . . capreaeque . . . *inludunt*, *pascuntur* oves avidaeque iuvencae falls rather into Class II, according to the view of C., who holds that no second relative is understood; but certainly it appears more to the point to supply a complement for *pascuntur*, either the accusative *quam* or the ablative *qua*[214].

(c) An Ablative Pronoun to Be Supplied

1'. *AFTER A DATIVE*

If *qua* rather than *quam* is the relative to be supplied in the foregoing example, that example belongs under a new category, illustrating the omission of a relative in the ablative. We have in addition one *certain* example[215] of such omission. In this, too, as in the preceding instance, the missing ablative is to be supplied from a dative.

---

[214]We can find authority in Vergil for either. The accusative with *pascor* is used in G. 3.314–315 pascuntur . . . rubos et . . . dumos, G. 4.181 pascuntur. . . arbuta, 2.471 mala gramina pastus; the ablative in E. 5.77 thymo pascentur, E. 9.31 cytiso pastae, G. 3.231 carice pastus, G. 3.528 frondibus . . . pascuntur.

[215]I say "one certain example", since in two other passages it is possible that we are to supply, not an ablative by itself, but one with a preposition (*in*). In both of these, the omitted phrase follows a relative in the accusative. The first is 4.69–71 cerva . . ., *quam* procul . . . *fixit* pastor agens telis *liquit*que volatile ferrum. Of this K.[2] says, "*et in qua liquit volatile ferrum* would be more exact." However, the sense is clear and complete without the insertion of *in qua*, and therefore it is perhaps sufficient to view *liquitque* as standing not for *et in qua liquit* but for *linquens*. Accordingly the passage is listed again below (59) as an illustration of Class II. On the other hand, logic demands that some connective word or phrase be supplied in the second example, 5.287–289 campum, *quem* collibus undique curvis *cingebant* silvae, mediaque in valle theatri circus *erat*. This connective is perhaps *in quo*. However, this would involve considerable awkwardness in connection with *in valle*, and so probably *ubi* is to be preferred. The matter is further complicated by the fact that either *in quo* or *ubi* adds no new idea, but is practically equivalent to the words actually used, *media . . . in valle*. Compare note 228. Therefore here again it is perhaps better not to supply a relative at all; the passage in question is then an example not of Class I but of Class II, the type in which the second clause is equivalent logically to an ablative absolute (compare 62–67). In this instance, however, we cannot actually form the ablative absolute, since *erat* cannot provide us with a present participle, and *circo* cannot stand alone (although some instances of the so-called ablative of attendant circumstance, which are quite as remote from the rest of the sentence, seem to have been generated in just this fashion: on the relation between the ablative absolute and the ablative of attendant circumstance, see note 500). Perhaps the lacking ablative absolute might be replaced by *cum circo* or *circum habens*, though neither seems truly idiomatic. The latter is in line with the view of Wagner (Q. V. 34.4), who, as I found subsequently to writing the above, paraphrases by *qui silvis cinctus medium habebat circum*.

If, on the other hand, *ubi* is to be supplied, we may compare 9.387–388 (see 50) and 5.250–253 (see note 218); also G. 4.8–12 sedes . . . statioque petenda, *quo*

The passage in question is 6.349–350 gubernaclum. . . , *cui* datus *haerebam* custos cursusque *regebam*, in which we supply *quo* with *regebam*.

More uncertain than the examples cited above are those in which the relative to be supplied is in the dative or in the genitive. Since substantives in these cases have, as a rule, a less close and direct relation with the rest of the sentence than those in the nominative or in the accusative, it is often a question whether we must supply such a relative at all, or should rather regard the sentence as belonging to Class II.

(d) A Dative Pronoun to Be Supplied

1′. *AFTER A NOMINATIVE*

In one instance, already referred to[216], the omission of a dative pronoun follows a nominative. This is 12.134–136 e summo, *qui* nunc Albanus *habetur*, tum neque nomen *erat* neque honos aut gloria monti, prospiciens tumulo campum aspectabat. We are perhaps to supply *cui* with *erat*; but the *tum* clause may be parenthetical, as it is possibly in 9.388 and positively in 8.100 (see above, 50).

2′. *AFTER AN ACCUSATIVE*

All the other instances occur after accusative relatives.

In E. 3.12–15 arcum. . .et calamos, *quae* tu. . . , et cum *vidisti* puero donata, dolebas, et si non aliqua *nocuisses*, mortuus esses, we are perhaps to supply *quibus* with *nocuisses*; but if the omitted complement of *nocuisses* is to be supplied from *puero* rather than from *quae*, this is clearly an example of Class II.

In G. 3.282–283 hippomanes, *quod* saepe malae *legere* novercae *miscueruntque* herbas et non innoxia verba, we are perhaps to supply

---

neque *sit* ventis aditus . . . neque oves haedique . . . floribus *insultent*, aut errans bucula campo *decutiat* rorem et surgentis *atterat* herbas. Here *campo* repeats *quo* just as *media. . .in valle* repeats *quem* (compare note 228). C. suggests that *quo* might be possible throughout, as *floribus insultent* implies motion (and so, I suppose, does *errans. . .campo*); but surely the motion is rather *within* than *into* the locality involved. P., on the other hand, would supply simply *ibi*, since, he says, the final force of *quo* extends to both clauses. Such a procedure would make this example correspond with those passages in which a demonstrative follows a relative (see 41–47). But *ubi* assuredly provides better balance with *quo*, and it can, of course, likewise be employed as a final particle. Certainly, then, I think *ubi* is to be supplied here from *quo*. Compare the two other examples where possibly, though by no means positively, *ubi* is to be supplied from a relative adverb—this time *unde*—, G. 2.207–211 and G. 3.278–279, discussed below, 61–62. Contrast with these the example cited above (40) of the insertion of *quo* in a clause following one introduced by *ubi*—G. 2.266–267.

[216]Note 204.

cui with *miscuerunt*; but the act of mixing may refer merely to *herbas* and *verba*. Moreover, strong evidence against the supplying of a dative is furnished by the parallel passage G. 2.128–129 pocula si quando saevae infecere novercae miscueruntque herbas et non innoxia verba[217].

In 5.250–253 chlamydem. . .*quam*. . .*circum* purpura. . .cucurrit, *intextus*que puer. . .cervos. . .fatigat, we may supply *cui* with *intextus*[218].

In 10.305–307 viros mediis exponit in undis, fragmina remorum *quos* et fluitantia transtra *impediunt*, *retrahit*que pedes simul unda relabens, we may supply *quibus* with *retrahit*[219], if the meaning is that the wave makes the men lose their footing. Would it be possible, however, by a very bold metaphor, to interpret, 'the wave withdraws its feet'[220]? In this case, we must insert a longer pause—a semicolon or a colon—after *impediunt*[221].

In 12.674–675 turrim. . .*quam eduxerat* ipse *subdiderat*que rotas pontisque *instraverat*, we supply *cui* with *subdiderat* and *instraverat*.

In 12.845–848 Dirae, *quas*. . .uno eodemque *tulit* partu, paribusque *revinxit* serpentum spiris ventosasque *addidit* alas[222], *quas* belongs with *revinxit* as well as with *tulit*, but *quibus* must be supplied with *addidit*[223].

In 11.67–71 iuvenem. . . *qualem*. . .florem. . .non iam mater *alit* tellus virisque *ministrat*, we supply *quali* (*flori*) with *ministrat*.

(e) A Genitive Pronoun to Be Supplied

Even more remote from the rest of the sentence, and less essential to it, than the dative, is the genitive. In most of the following examples, it is not at all certain that any relative need be supplied. In a

[217]However, there is some doubt as to the genuineness of the second line here. See the discussion in C.

[218]Or possibly *ubi*, with *fatigat*? Compare 9.387–388 (50) and 5.287–289 (note 215).

[219]Or possibly *quorum*, with *pedes*: between the dative of reference with a verb, and the genitive of possession with a noun, there is frequently little difference. Compare Haverfield on G. 3.258.

[220]The way might be paved for this by such natural expressions as *currentem . . . undam* in G. 3.330 (with which we may compare *procurrens . . . pontus* in 11.624), *Thybris . . . substitit unda* in 8.86–87, and perhaps *sequacibus undis* in 5.193; and a striking parallel is provided by 9.125 revocatque pedem Tiberinus ab alto. Compare, too, Horace, Epodon Liber 16.48 levis crepante lympha desilit pede. However, it may be that the figurative use of the singular of *pes* does not justify that of the plural.

[221]C. has a comma, H. no punctuation mark at all.

[222]But perhaps the passage is made smoother by the inserted *et . . . Megaeram* parallel to the relative *quas* (see 42).

[223]Unless the understood dative refers rather to *spiris* than to *quas*—in which case we have once more an example of Class II.

few, we might conceivably supply a relative in the dative instead of in the genitive[224].

1'. *AFTER A DATIVE*

Two of the instances of the possible omission of a relative in the genitive follow a dative.

One is 7.742–743 tegmina *quis* capitum raptus de subere cortex, aerataeque micant *peltae*, micat[225] aereus *ensis*. We may supply *quorum* with *peltae* and *ensis*.

The other is 12.518–520 Arcada, piscosae *cui* circum flumina Lernae ars *fuerat* pauperque domus, nec[226] *nota* potentum munera, conductaque *pater* tellure serebat. In this passage *cui*, expressed with *ars fuerat pauperque domus*, is to be understood with *nota* (*erant*), but *cuius* must be supplied with *pater . . . serebat*.

2'. *AFTER AN ABLATIVE*

Two other examples follow an ablative.

One of these is 5.401–403 caestus . . . , *quibus* acer Eryx in proelia suetus *ferre* manum duroque intendere bracchia *tergo*. Here we may supply *quorum* with *tergo*[227]. C., however, apparently would not, for he calls *duroque . . . tergo* "an adjunct not grammatically connected with the relative clause". Wagner would supply a genitive, but not a relative, since he, like C., regards the second clause as not coordinate with the first, as he shows by his paraphrase (Q. V. 34.4), *duro intendens eorum corio*, which amounts to much the same thing as *quorumque duro intendere bracchia tergo*.

A preposition accompanies the ablative in the second example, 5.323–324 Helymus. . . , *quo* deinde *sub* ipso ecce volat *calcem*que terit iam calce Diores. We may supply *cuius* with *calcem*.

3'. *AFTER AN ACCUSATIVE*

In most of the passages containing a clause in which a relative in the genitive may be supplied, this clause follows a relative in the accusative.

In 2.138–140 natos exoptatumque parentem, *quos* illi fors et poenas ob nostra *reposcent* effugia, et culpam hanc miserorum *morte* piabunt, we may supply *quorum* with *morte*[228].

[224]Compare note 219. [225]'Connective variant repetition'. For the slight change (in number), compare note 166, where a similar slight change (in case) is commented on. [226]For the un-Latin combination of *nec* and a relative, see note 189.

[227]Compare note 228.

[228]To this example even more than to those which he cites, applies Wagner's interesting note (in Q. V. 34.4): "Multa ex <exemplis ubi Copula, praegresso Relativo, inaequalia membra iungit> . . . non sine arte ita temperavit Virgilius, ut in altera sententiae parte aliquod, nominis praegressi vice fungens, adiiceret vocabulum, quod copulae iunctum vim fere repetiti Relativi haberet." *Miserorum*

In 2.355–358 lupi. . . , *quos*. . .*exegit* caecos rabies *catul*ique relicti . . .exspectant, we may supply *quorum*, as does K. Still, there seems no good reason why *quos* cannot hold through the whole sentence, being object of both *exegit* and *exspectant*[229].

In 3.381–382 Italiam, *quam* tu iam *rere* propinquam vicinosque, ignare, paras invadere *portus*, we may supply *cuius* with *portus*.

In 4.90–91 *quam* simul ac tali persensit peste *teneri* cara Iovis coniunx nec famam obstare *furori*, we may supply *cuius*[230] with *furori*. This example is simpler than most of those cited, since *quam* in line 90 is distinctly the connecting relative equal to *et eam*[231].

In 9.530–534 turris. . . , summis *quam* viribus. . .expugnare Itali summaque *evertere* opum vi certabant, Troes contra *defendere* saxis perque cavas densi tela intorquere *fenestras*, we may supply *cuius* with *fenestras*[232]. However, the prosaic *defendere saxis telisque quae per fenestras* (*eius*) *intorquebant* would be more logical.

In 10.518–520 iuvenes. . .viventis rapit, inferias *quos immolet* umbris captivoque rogi perfundat *sanguine* flammas, we may supply *quorum* with *sanguine*[233]. From our point of view, the irregularity is less striking than usual, since for us *quos* = *ut eos*[234], but it is doubtful whether the Romans viewed the relative in this way.

In 10.673–675 *quos*. . .*reliqui* et nunc palantis *video*, *gemitum*que cadentum accipio, we may supply *quorum* with *gemitum*[235].

---

certainly plays this part here. The instances that Wagner gives are 5.403 *tergo* (see page 55), 5.288 *valle* (note 215), 9.489 *tela* (57), 10.243 *oras* (57), 10.520 *captivo* (56), 11.75 *telas* (57), 12.262 *vestra* (57), 12.944 *inimicum* (60). To these examples I would add, besides 2.138–140, four more instances: G.4.11 *campo* (note 215), 4.251 *senis* (66), 10.674 *cadentum* (56), and 12.135 *monti* (note 204). An English example that is rather similar is a sentence from The Globe, March 25, 1922, page 3: "The chief weapon of the pygmies is the poisoned arrow, *which* they *shoot* from a hiding-place and *pursue* their prey until it dies of poison." Perhaps the phrase *of poison*, by bringing back to our minds the poisoned arrow of the main clause, softens the inconcinnity here to some extent. It is with this phrase that we should have to supply a second relative (*of which* or *from which*) if we are to supply any at all; but it seems more likely that this sentence is to be regarded as an instance of Class II, like a number of the other passages cited in this note. For other English examples, see note 247.

[229]To supply *quos* seems to me at once simpler, and productive of better balance, than to supply *quorum*. In the latter case, we must either supply *eos* as well as *quorum* (as Professor Knapp tells me he would), or view *exspectant* as intransitive, which appears to me undesirable, since it does not stress so effectively the intimate connection of the young with the parent-wolves.

[230]Compare note 226. [231]Compare 46–47 (on 9.344–350) and note 183.

[232]Here, as in other instances, the distance of the second clause from the relative in the first clause may well be a contributing factor.

[233]Compare note 228.

[234]Compare P's. note on G. 4.9: "The final force of *quo* (= *ut eo*) extends to both clauses, but in the second some such word as *ibi* must be supplied" (see note 215, end). Compare also on the connecting relative in 4.90–91 (cited just above).

[235]Compare note 228.

In 12.261–263 miseri, *quos*. . .advena. . .*territat*. . . , et *litora* vestra[236] vi populat, we may obtain a perfectly logical form by supplying *quorum* with *litora* and removing *vestra*[237].

Finally, we may list six examples forming a group by themselves, in which it is just possible that genitives are to be supplied, but most unlikely, especially since in each instance the second clause is logically subordinate to the first, being equivalent to a participle[238].

In 10.242–243 clipeum. . .*quem dedit*. . .Ignipotens atque *oras* ambiit auro[239], *cuius* might be supplied with *oras*. But from another point of view, we might say that *atque*. . .*ambiit* really almost = *ambiens*; however, the tense of the participle would be inaccurate[240].

In 4.262–264 ensis erat Tyrioque ardebat murice laena. . . , dives *quae*[241] munera Dido *fecerat*, et tenui *telas* discreverat auro, *quorum* might be supplied with *telas*. But it seems better to say that *et*. . .*discreverat* really = *discernens*.

In 11.72–75 vestis. . . , *quas*. . .Dido *fecerat* et tenui *telas* discreverat *auro*[242], *quarum* might be supplied with *telas*. Again *et* . . .*discreverat* = *discernens*.

In 9.488–489 veste. . .*quam*. . .urgebam, et *tela* curas solabar anilis[243], *cuius* might be supplied with *tela*. Really *et*. . .*solabar* = *solans*. However, Wagner (in Q. V. 34.4) inverts this analysis, giving *quam urgens solabar*[244].

---

[236]See note 168. [237]Compare note 228.

[238]Compare 58–67, especially 58–60 and 62–64. See also 55, on 5.401–403.

[239]Compare note 228.

[240]So, indeed, is the tense in *ambiit*, if this verb is to follow *dedit*, for we should expect *ambierat*, or *postquam ambiit*, unless *dedit* = *fecit*, corresponding to *fecerat* in the next two examples, 4.262–264 and 11.72–75. Despite these parallels, it is extremely unlikely that *dedit* is used in the sense of *fecit* in the passage here under consideration; and if it is not, we cannot account for the chronological discrepancy between *dedit* and the following *ambiit* on any other grounds than that this is an example of '*hysteron proteron*'.

[241]On the special peculiarity inherent in this *quae*, see note 30.

[242]Compare note 228. [243]Compare note 228.

[244]A similar inversion is doubtless possible also in the two preceding examples and in the following one. In that case the verb that I replace by a participle would remain a finite verb, and *faciens* would be substituted for *fecerat* or *fecit*. But to my mind logic rather demands the opposite treatment. Compare notes 163, 247 (at the close), 251, 258, 263, 267, 268, 750. Comparable, too, is the structure of 10.882–884 telumque intorsit in hostem; inde aliud super atque aliud *figit*que *volat*que ingenti gyro, sed sustinet . . . umbo. Here *figit* and *volat* are illogically coordinated; either may, without serious change in thought or breach of logic, be made subordinate to the other. We may say *figit dum volat* or *figit volans*; K. gives the former, and N. implies something of the sort by his explanation, "he throws them as he flies". We may also say *volat dum figit* or *volat figens*; for the latter we may compare *equitavit* . . . *iaciens* just below (10.885–886). Wagner (Q. V. 34.3) offers us a choice between *figit volans* and *figens volat*.

In 7.189–191 Picus. . . , *quem*. . .coniunx. . *fecit* avem Circe sparsitque coloribus *alas*, *cuius* might be supplied with *alas*[245]. Really *sparsitque* = *spargens*.

In 6.283–284 ulmus. . . , *quam* sedem Somnia. . . *tenere* ferunt, *foliis*que sub omnibus haerent[246], *cuius* might be supplied with *foliis*. Really *-que* . . . *haerent* = *haerentia*.

(3) No Pronoun to Be Supplied in Second Clause

(a) Second Clause = a Nominative Participle

1′. *AFTER AN ACCUSATIVE*

In the six instances just cited, it seems improbable that a relative has been omitted and is therefore to be supplied. In a great many other instances, this is not merely improbable, but actually impossible. In other words, we have now passed from Class I to Class II[247].

Of Class II E. 2.37–38 fistula, Damoetas dono mihi *quam dedit* olim, et *dixit* moriens is a type. Here we are probably to recognize a fusion of *eam* (= *fistulam*) *Damoetas dedit et dixit* and *fistula, Damoetas*

[245]Or possibly *cui*, with *sparsit*. Compare 10.305–307 (54 and note 219).

[246]Here the situation is further complicated by the fact that *ferunt* and *haerent* are not really parallel, and in consequence *Somnia* has to serve both as an accusative with *tenere* and as a nominative with *haerent*. We have a fusion here of *Somnia tenere ferunt, foliisque sub omnibus haerere* and *Somnia tenent, ut ferunt, foliisque sub omnibus haerent*. On the use of *haerent* instead of the more logical *haerere*, see 222–223.

[247]In English, instances of Class II are, I think, somewhat commoner than those of Class I. A typical example is this one from The World, May 9, 1922, page 11: "They have the notion that baseball . . . is something *which* they must *admire* or *break* our hearts." Page provides an example in his note on 11.264: "This proved to be his own son, *whom* he sacrificed, and was then expelled by his subjects". This usage is one which C., perhaps in the interests of brevity, seems especially inclined to employ. I have noted, e. g., the following: (1) in his introduction to E. 6, "Silenus, *whom* Midas *restores* to Bacchus, and *receives* in return the fatal gift of turning things to gold"; (2) in his summary of 6.417–425, "The Sibyl throws him a drugged cake, *which* he *eats* and *falls* asleep"; (3) in his summary of 9.717–777, "shutting in Turnus, *whom* he *encounters* and *is killed*". (Compare also the examples quoted in note 175.) All the instances here cited we might treat as examples of Class I, supplying in the first *for whom* with *in return*, in the second *because of which* with *falls asleep*, and in the third *by whom* with *is killed*. But it is probably simpler to deal with them as instances of Class II. Then we may say that in the first *and receives* = *receiving*, in the second *and falls asleep* = *falling asleep* (*immediately thereafter*), in the third *and is killed* = *being killed*. The lack of exactness in the tense of the participle (on which see note 250) is less marked in English, so frequently careless in this respect, than in Latin. Indeed, I doubt whether we notice it at all in the first and the third examples. In the second I was distinctly conscious of it, and therefore inserted the softening words in parentheses. Possibly in this instance, as in those referred to in note 244, we ought rather to interchange the participle and the finite verb, and read, 'a drugged cake, which having eaten, he falls asleep'. This, however, is a construction that seems hardly possible in modern English. The only occurrence of it that comes to my mind is in Longfellow's A Psalm of Life, lines 29–32, "Footprints, that perhaps another, . . . Seeing, shall take heart again".

quam dedit, dicens. Likewise in the following examples the second clause is logically equivalent to a nominative participle[248].

Thus in G. 1.345–347 eat hostia. . . , omnis *quam* chorus et socii *comitentur*. . . , et Cererem. . .*vocent*, we may say that *et vocent* = *vocantes*, unless we are to regard *vocent* as parallel with *eat* rather than with *comitentur*; but in any event it must get its subject from the relative clause, so that the second interpretation seems less logical (compare the last paragraph of note 181, on G. 1.199–203).

1.469–472 tentoria. . . , primo *quae* prodita somno Tydides multa *vastabat* caede cruentus, ardentisque *avertit* equos in castra is not dissimilar. We cannot treat this example after the usual formula, and say that *-que avertit* = *avertens*, because of the difference in tense[249] and in time. But the type remains the same.

In 4.69–71 *cerva*. . ., *quam*. . .*fixit* pastor. . .*liquit*que volatile ferrum, *liquitque* almost = *linquens*[250]. But perhaps this example belongs rather under the head of Class I, since it is possible to supply *in qua* with *liquit* (see note 215).

In 6.549–551 moenia. . . , *quae*. . .*ambit*. . .amnis. . . , *torquet*que sonantia saxa, *torquetque* = *torquens*.

In 7.21–23 *quae* ne monstra pii *paterentur* talia Troes. . . neu litora dira *subirent*, Neptunus ventis implevit vela secundis, *neu*. . . *subirent*, according to our usual formula[251], = *subeuntes*[252]. But, since *quae* (21) is the connecting relative, the anomaly is less marked than usual[253].

In 7.330 *quam* Iuno his *acuit* verbis ac talia *fatur*, *ac*. . .*fatur* = *fans*, or, in accordance with Vergil's common practice, *fata*.

In 10.401–404 derexerat hastam, *quam* medius Rhoeteus *intercipit* . . . , curruque volutus *caedit*. . .arva, *-que*. . .*caedit* = *caedens*[254]. The semicolon which N. places before *curruque* (where H. and K. have only a comma) rather veils the irregularity here; but it exists none the

---

[248]Compare the treatment of the six preceding examples (57–58).

[249]See note 102.

[250]Here, as often (compare what was said of the preceding example), the tense of the suggested participle is not strictly accurate. It is, however, as nearly so as is that of many participles which Vergil actually uses. Compare note 560.

[251]However, since (as is pointed out again below, 184) the action indicated by *paterentur* is prevented only indirectly, that indicated by *subirent* directly, perhaps the rather clumsy *quae ne monstra passuri pii Troes subirent* would be more logical. Compare note 244.

[252]Compare note 250.

[253]It would almost be possible to understand a second connecting relative *quae* with *litora*, referring back to line 10 proxima Circaeae raduntur litora terrae (note *litora* there too). On the connecting relative compare 56 (on 4.90–91) and note 231, also notes 171 and 255.

[254]However, this substitute is far from satisfactory, both because of the inaccuracy of the tense (compare note 250) and because of the combination of two participles, *volutus* . . . *caedens*, which it involves (compare note 718).

less, even though we may regard this as an example of a sort of inverted form, like a *cum inversum* clause, for *hastam quam derexerat Rhoeteus intercipit, curruque volutus caedit arva*[255].

In 12.943–944 Pallantis pueri, victum *quem* vulnere Turnus *straverat* atque umeris inimicum insigne gerebat[256], we cannot substitute the participle *gerens*, because of the difference in time between *straverat* and *gerebat*[257], but the principle remains the same. We might have placed this example in Class I, supplying *cuius* with *insigne*, had it not been for the use of *inimicum*[258]. Perhaps we can still do so if we regard *inimicum* as used proleptically, or if we recognize a fusion of *quem Turnus straverat atque cuius insigne gerebat* and *quem postquam stravit, inimicum insigne gerebat Turnus*.

In the nine examples just considered, in which the relative actually expressed was a direct object of the first verb, we could attain a fair degree of certainty as to whether it bore the same relation to the second verb. But in some instances we cannot be so sure.

2′. *AFTER A DATIVE*

When the expressed relative is a dative, we may be in some doubt as to whether or not its force is felt throughout the second clause as well as the first. Thus we may deal with 6.158–159 *cui* fidus Achates it *comes* et paribus curis vestigia *figit* as we dealt with the passages cited in the previous section, and say that *et. . .figit=figens*. But on the other hand we may also say that *cui* is used not only with *comes* in the first clause but also with *paribus* in the second[259]. To be sure, strict logic would require not *cui* but *cuius* (*curis*), giving us a relative construction falling within Class I; but such anomalies are common enough in Vergil[260]. In any event, note that *cui* is merely a connecting relative[261].

[255]This version, however, as Professor Knapp justly points out to me, robs the killer of the prominence which is rightly his. As a matter of fact the two pictures—first that of the act of the slayer, and then that of the suffering of the slain—are equally important, constituting as they do two successive scenes, with the emphasis shifted from the first to the second; so that really *quam* is virtually a connecting relative (for which see note 253).

[256]Compare note 228.

[257]Compare 59, on 1.469–472.

[258]Wagner, on the other hand, paraphrases by *cuius strati insigne gerebat*, thus subordinating the first member instead of the second (Q.V. 34.4). Compare note 244.

[259]For an example of *cui* with *par*, see Horace, Carmina 1.24.6–8 cui . . . inveniet parem.

[260]And, indeed, in all Latin. A good illustration of 'compendiary comparison' from Horace is Sermones 1.6.92–93 mea discrepat istis et vox et ratio, where *istis* certainly stands for *istorum voci et rationi*. As examples of Vergil's use of the construction, we may note G. 3.266 ante omnis furor est insignis equarum, 5.492 ante omnis exit locus Hippocoontis, 7.649–650 Lausus, quo pulchrior alter non fuit excepto Laurentis corpore Turni, 11.634–635 permixti caede virorum . . . volvuntur equi. On the last two, see further below, 200 and 209, respectively.

[261]Compare on 7.21–23, 59 and note 253.

3′. *AFTER AN ABLATIVE*

The same doubt exists when the expressed relative is an ablative.

In G. 2.127–130 felicis mali, *quo* non *praesentius* ullum. . .auxilium *venit* ac membris *agit* atra venena, *ac. . .agit* = *agens*, unless we are to take *praesentius* with *agit* as well as with *venit*[262].

In 1.160–161 laterum, *quibus* omnis ab alto *frangitur* inque sinus *scindit* sese unda reductos, *-que. . .scindit* = *scindens*, unless we are to regard *scindit sese* as equivalent to *scinditur*, and therefore modified by the ablative of means *quibus*, or else are to consider that there is a fusion of the two expressions *scindit sese* and *quibus scinditur*[263].

4′. *AFTER AN ADVERB*[264]

Very similar to a relative in the ablative is the relative adverb *unde*. Therefore, examples in which this connective figures are quite in place here. (Compare 15, on E. 3.72.)

In G. 2.207–211 *unde* iratus silvam *devexit* arator et nemora *evertit*. . . , antiquasque domos avium. . .*eruit*; illae altum nidis *petiere* relictis; at rudis *enituit* impulso vomere campus, the words *et. . .evertit. . .-que. . .eruit* = *evertens. . .-que eruens*. Here it is quite feasible to supply *ubi* from *unde* with *evertit* and *eruit*, and so to bring about an example belonging to Class I; but, as C. thinks, this is unnecessary with these verbs, and it is, moreover, impossible with the following verb *petiere*, which, despite the semicolon before *illae* and the absence of a connective, ought to have the same treatment as the preceding verb, unless its clause is to be regarded as parenthetical.

In G. 3.278–279 *unde. . .*Auster *nascitur* et pluvio *contristat* frigore caelum, *et. . .contristat* = *contristans*. We might keep *unde* throughout, or supply *ubi* from it as in the preceding example; but this is very

---

[262]We may compare a corresponding example with an interrogative, 4.235–236 *qua spe . . . moratur* nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia *respicit* arva?, where *nec . . . respicit* = *non respiciens*. But *qua spe* might be joined with *nec . . . respicit*, which from our point of view is equal to *et . . . non-respicit*. Compare Horace, Carmina 1.3.38–40 neque per nostrum patimur scelus iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina, where *per nostrum . . . scelus* modifies not *patimur* but rather *neque . . . patimur*, that is, *et . . . non-patimur*. We may perhaps also compare 4.5 nec . . . membris dat cura quietem, where the action of *cura* is not that of *nec dat* but that of *et non-dat*.

For another instance of this use of an interrogative, compare 10.811, discussed in note 265.

[263]Perhaps the emphasis is on *scindit sese* rather than on *frangitur*. If so, we may paraphrase by *quibus omnis ab alto fracta in sinus scindit sese unda reductos*. Compare note 244.

[264]Compare G. 4.8–12; see note 215.

unlikely, since the effect of Auster is not limited to any one quarter but extends everywhere.

One example involving a relative adverb[265] is absolutely free from doubt. This is 3.107–109 *unde* pater. . .*est advectus* in oras, *optavit*que locum regno. Here we cannot follow our regular formula and supply *optans*[266], but must rather supply *optaturus* or *qui postea optavit*[267].

(b) Second Clause = an Ablative Absolute

In all the above examples (58–62), the subject of the relative and the non-relative clause is the same. In some other cases the subject shifts, and we must then regard the non-relative clause as the equivalent not of a nominative participle but of an ablative absolute.

1′. *After an Accusative with a Verb*

Thus in G. 4.511–514 qualis. . .philomela. . .amissos queritur fetus, *quos* durus arator observans nido implumis *detraxit*; at *illa flet* noctem, we may say that *at illa flet* = *illa flente*[268]. This passage is complicated somewhat by the fact that the subject of the second, non-parallel clause happens to be the same as that of the main clause[269]. Thus, while, in accordance with our usual formula, we may see fusion of *philomela queritur fetus, quos arator detraxit, illa flente* and *eos* (=*fetus*) *arator detraxit at illa flet noctem*, the really logical[270] form would be *philomela queritur fetus, quos arator detraxit, et flet*

---

[265]Compare the use of the interrogative adverb in 10.811 *quo* moriture *ruis* maioraque viribus *audes*?, where *-que . . . audes* = *audens*. For another example with an interrogative, see note 262, on 4.235–236. We may note a similar use with an interrogative adjective, 6.771–772 qui iuvenes! *quantas ostentant*, aspice, *viris* atque umbrata *gerunt* civili tempora quercu! Here *atque . . . gerunt* = *gerentes*. But possibly we are to supply *ut* derived from the preceding *qui* and *quantas*. It is perhaps simpler to put the exclamation point after *viris* and treat *atque . . . quercu* as a separate sentence, as does Ribbeck. On the influence of punctuation in such matters, compare note 182.

[266]Compare 60 and note 257, on 12.943–944.

[267]Doubtless it would be more natural in Latin to give to this idea the main force, and say *unde . . . advectus . . . optavit*. Compare note 244.

[268]The present participle, in view of *noctem*, would be rather loosely used here. Compare note 250. Indeed, in relation to the despoiling, the lamentation, though it undoubtedly began immediately, belongs rather to a subsequent than to a contemporaneous period: *fetibus ab aratore detractis, illa flet noctem* would better render the relation of the two verbs. Compare what was said of 3.107–109, 62 and notes 266 and 267; and see also note 244.

[269]Indeed, *illa flet noctem* is merely a repetition of *philomela . . . queritur*, with one new element—that involved in *noctem*—added.

[270]Though far less poignant (compare note 273). I would not lose the hopeless melancholy of that *at*, for all the logic in the world. We may compare the use of *at* in G. 2.210–211 (quoted on 61). Note further *illae* there, as a parallel for *illa* here. But there the birds' destitution is contrasted not with the cruelty of man, but with the increased productiveness of the field (see P's. interesting note *ad loc.*).

noctem. It is possible that this form may actually have been in Vergil's mind; that then to avoid ambiguity—since a casual reader might conceivably be misled for the moment into thinking *arator* the subject of *flet*—, or to point the contrast, in accordance with his usual tender pathos, between the ruthless[271] man and the bereft bird[272], he inserted *illa*; and that finally, forgetting, himself, for the moment that *flet* was parallel to *queritur*, not to *detraxit*, he actually inserted not a copulative but an adversative conjunction[273].

In 5.118–120 Chimaeram, . . .triplici pubes *quam* Dardana versu *impellunt*, terno *consurgunt* ordine *remi*, *consurgunt remi* = *consurgentibus remis*[274]. Since there is no connective, we may perhaps obviate the irregularity by making the clause *terno. . .remi* parenthetical, as K. does; C. and H., however, merely set it off from the relative clause by a comma.

A passage that may belong here is 5.152–154 Gyas, *quem* deinde Cloanthus *consequitur*, melior remis, sed pondere *pinus* tarda *tenet*. Perhaps *sed. . . pinus. . . tenet* = *pinu* (*eum*) *tenente*. However, this seems to me extremely doubtful. See below, 132.

A very difficult passage is 10.702–706 Euanthen Phrygium Paridisque Mimanta aequalem comitemque, una *quem* nocte Theano in lucem genitori Amyco *dedit* et face praegnas *Cisseis* regina Parim *creat*; urbe paterna occubat, ignarum Laurens habet ora Mimanta. Here *et. . . Cisseis. . . Parim creat* = *Cisseide Parim creante*; but this does not quite harmonize with *una. . . nocte*. The case is complicated by the presence of fusion, of *eum* (= *Mimanta*) *una nocte Theano dedit et Cisseis Parim creat* and *quem eadem nocte Theano dedit qua* (or *ac*) *Cisseis Parim creat*, the relative clause being recast into a form suggested by the simple *quem. . . Theano. . . dedit*, and perhaps also by a

---

[271]Note *durus*.

[272]Compare note 270.

[273]As I have tried to show, he gains enormously thereby. The coupling of the two almost synonymous clauses (compare note 269), *philomela . . . queritur* and *illa flet*, by the connective, might be defended as an example of Vergil's common use of parallelism; and yet it would be banal in comparison with the use of the pathetic disjunctive *at* (see note 270).

The order, too, is worthy of note. Our *first* and *last* thoughts alike are for the bird's sorrow; and the very repetition of *philomela . . . queritur* involved in *illa flet* seems to suggest the recurrence of the nightingale's sad song. Note the piling up of words expressing sorrow in the entire passage, 511–515—*maerens, queritur, flet, miserabile, maestis*. I can think of nothing comparable except Catullus 101.

Profesor Knapp has suggested that the point of order just referred to, that is, the construction of a passage in such a way that it begins and ends with the same image or idea, is a characteristic feature of Vergil's style. See The Classical Weekly 19.109; also the notes in K.[2] on 2.453–455, 3.319, 4.611–612.

[274]But the parallelism is vastly more effective. Compare the similar repetition of the idea of a tripled force, in 8.563–566 (discussed above, 49) and in E. 8.73–75.

hypothetical *Parim Phrygium* (to replace *Euanthen Phrygium*) *Paridisque* (or *eiusque*) *Mimanta aequalem comitemque, quos una nocte Theano dedit et Cisseis creat* or the simpler *Parim Phrygium Mimantaque aequales comitesque*[275], *quos una nocte Theano dedit et Cisseis creat.* In any event, *creat,* even though if it were used independently its tense might be justified[276], seems odd when made parallel to *dedit*[277]. Bentley removes it altogether, and in its stead after *Parim* inserts *Paris,* to serve as a subject for *occubat,* which needs a subject, as C. admits, though he refuses to accept Bentley's conjecture. But the relative merits of these two readings do not concern us here. Even if we decide to follow Bentley, as does H., our explanation will remain the same as that given above, except that we must replace *creat* by *dedit* and *creante* by *dante.* This statement likewise applies if we follow R. Ellis[278], who sacrifices neither the *creat* of the MSS. nor the *Paris* of Bentley, but instead omits *Parim,* although it seems at least as hard to explain *creat* without an object[279] as it is to explain *occubat* without a subject.

Here again[280] (62–64) we have been dealing with passages in which the relative is the direct object of the first verb, so that we can be quite certain about its relation to the second verb. But once more we find some passages concerning which we cannot be so positive.

2′. *AFTER AN ACCUSATIVE WITH A PREPOSITION*

If the relative is the object not of a verb but of a preposition, it is frequently hard to be certain whether or not its force extends to the second clause.

An example of this sort is 8.416–421 insula. . . , *quam subter* specus et Cyclopum exesa caminis antra Aetnaea *tonant,* validique incudibus *ictus* auditi *referunt* gemitus, *striduntque* cavernis *stricturae* Chalybum et fornacibus *ignis anhelat.* Here *-que. . . ictus. . . referunt. . . striduntque. . . stricturae. . . et. . . ignis anhelat* perhaps = *ictibus referentibus stridentibusque stricturis et igni anhelante.* But *quam subter* may apply to all these verbs.

---

[275] *Paridis . . . Mimanta aequalem comitemque* may have helped to drive Vergil astray. Perhaps he felt subconsciously that he was virtually mentioning both *aequales,* Paris and Mimas. Just so, *geminus. . . Pollux* in Horace, Carmina 3.29.64, and *geminus . . . Castor* in Ovid, Ars Amatoria 1.746, both surely stand for both twins. In the same way 9.774–775 amicum Crethea Musis, Crethea Musarum comitem, and Horace, Carmina 1.26.1 Musis amicus seem to me to imply a mutual friendship and comradeship as existing between the Muses and their protégés. We may further compare what was said (12–13) of 10.734–735.

[276] Compare C's. note. [277] See note 110.

[278] According to H., who does not give specific references.

[279] Unless we go on emending and change *quem* in 703 to *quos.* That would simplify matters considerably. [280] Compare 60.

In G. 3.260–262 ⟨iuvenis⟩ *quem super* ingens porta *tonat* caeli, et scopulis inlisa *reclamant aequora, et. . .reclamant aequora* probably = *reclamantibus aequoribus*. This is less doubtful, since the roaring of the seas could scarcely be said to be above the swimmer as is the roaring of heaven's portal. But there is another possibility—suggested by Martyn and mentioned with approval by C.—, namely, that *reclamant* is transitive[281]: in that event it will have much the same meaning as *revocare* in the following line[282]. Then as its complement it needs *quem*, which is thus by a slight irregularity, less noticeable because *super* follows it instead of preceding it, the object of both a preposition and a verb[283], unless *super. . .tonat* is an example of tmesis (but this is not likely, as apparently no such verb as *supertono* exists).

3′. *AFTER A DATIVE*

The doubtful passages referred to above (64) also include two in which the relative is a dative.

In G. 4.127–129 senem, *cui* pauca relicti iugera ruris *erant*, nec *fertilis* illa iuvencis nec pecori opportuna *seges* nec *commoda* Baccho, the words *nec fertilis. . .nec. . .opportuna seges nec commoda* = *nec fertili nec opportuna segete nec commoda*[284]. Possibly *cui* as a dative of reference rather than a dative of the possessor might be understood with the second clause, but this seems most unlikely.[285]

[281]Since Vergil nowhere else uses *reclamo*, we cannot come to any decision on the basis of his practice in regard to this word. As for *clamo*, his usage varies. He makes it intransitive in 9.442 Rutuli clamantis in ore and 10.323 clamantis <or clamanti> sistit in ore; transitive in 4.674 morientem nomine clamat and E. 6.43–44 Hylan . . . relictum clamassent. With this last passage, we may compare its very obvious imitation by Valerius Flaccus, 3.596 rursus Hylan et rursus Hylan . . . reclamat. The same writer also uses *reclamo* in the same sense in 8.173–174 dominamque reclamant nomine. The passage in which these words occur, 171–174, on the lamentations over Medea's departure, is so full of reminiscences of the Aeneid as to be almost a Vergilian cento; and so it may well be that the particular words just quoted are meant to suggest the phrase occurring as part of the lamentations over Dido's death, 4.674 morientem nomine clamat, cited above with E. 6.43–44 as an example of Vergil's use of the simple verb *clamo* with an object. The quotations from Valerius Flaccus are given by Harpers' Dictionary as illustrating the use of *reclamo* in the sense of 'to call aloud or repeatedly', but to me this verb certainly means 'to call back'. However, Munro (280) expresses a doubt as to whether *reclamo* ever has this meaning, and accordingly objects to C's. approval of Martyn's view. (See H. Munro, Review of the Works of Virgil, with a Commentary by John Conington, M. A., Vol. 1, The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology 4.267–286.)

[282]G. 3.262 nec miseri possunt revocare parentes.

[283]Compare 8.310 miratur facilisque oculos fert omnia circum, where *omnia* is probably object of the verb *miratur* as well as of the preposition *circum*.

[284]Ablative of quality, or ablative absolute.

[285]Very similar to a sentence of this sort, although without a relative, is such a one as 6.860–862 ire videbat *egregium* forma *iuvenem* et fulgentibus armis, sed *frons laeta* parum et *deiecto lumina vultu*. If we expand *egregium . . . iuvenem* into

In 11.785–788 Apollo, quem. . .colimus, *cui*[286] pineus ardor acervo *pascitur*, et medium freti pietate per ignem cultores multa *premimus* vestigia prima, *et. . .premimus = nobis prementibus*. Since the walking on coals is apparently done in Apollo's honor, *cui* may perhaps be understood with *premimus*; but this does not seem very likely.

On the other hand, in 4.248–251 Atlantis, cinctum adsidue *cui* nubibus atris piniferum caput et vento *pulsatur* et imbri, nix umeros infusa *tegit*, tum flumina mento *praecipitant* senis, et glacie *riget* horrida barba, it would be very natural to supply *cui* in every clause, to show reference to the possessor with *umeros*, *mento*, and *barba*, precisely as with *caput*; but the presence of the genitive *senis* (for which see notes 168 and 228) absolutely forbids this in the last two clauses, and forces us to follow our usual formula, even though this destroys the balance, and say that *tum*[287] *flumina. . .praecipitant. . .et . . .riget. . .barba = fluminibus praecipitantibus et rigente barba*.

4′. *AFTER A GENITIVE*

We have also one example of an undoubted irregularity after a genitive: 6.893–896 sunt geminae Somni portae, *quarum* altera fertur cornea, qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris, *altera* candenti perfecta nitens elephanto, sed falsa ad caelum *mittunt* insomnia *manes*. The relative *quarum* itself unquestionably applies to the second *altera* as to the first. The difficulty is not at this point, but with line 896. Here, proceeding as usual, we might reduce the clause *sed. . . mittunt. . .manes* to an ablative absolute[288], *mittentibus manibus*, and recognize a fusion of the ablative absolute form and *altera*[289] *candenti perfecta nitens elephanto, sed ibi* (or, as K. supplies, *per hanc*) *falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia manes*, a contrast being recognized between the gleaming beauty of the door and the disappointing falseness of the

---

iuvenem qui erat egregius, we get almost a precise parallel, and we see better the peculiarity of the sentence as it stands, namely, that it represents a fusion of *ire videbat iuvenem egregium forma sed fronte laeta parum et deiectis luminibus* or *deiecto vultu* (to make these epithets more nearly parallel, we might replace the former by *egregia forma* or the latter by *fronte laetum parum et deiectum luminibus* or *deiectum vultu*) and *iuvenem qui erat egregius forma sed cuius* (compare note 184) *frons (erat) laeta parum et deiecto lumina vultu*. See also below, 134.

[286]The insertion of *cui* itself, after *quem*, is rather surprising. See 40. Compare the following example, 4.248–251, where similarly, but this time almost inevitably, *cui* follows *qui*. On this, too, see 40.

[287]*Tum*, like *et*, must be omitted in the substituted ablative absolute, since it is almost a connective. For its use here, to indicate a point in a description, not a point of time, see C. on G. 2.296.

[288]To be sure, the ablative absolute, in juxtaposition with *candenti perfecta nitens elephanto*, would be almost intolerably ugly.

[289]Here *altera* is used independently, not with the carried-over *quarum*.

dreams sent through it[290]. But 896 should be subordinated to 895 exactly as *qua. . .umbris* in 894 is to *altera fertur cornea*[291]; in other words, strict logic, against which Vergil's love of variety militates here as so often, would demand *qua* in 896 to replace *sed*.

b. PARENTHETICAL CLAUSE COORDINATED WITH PRECEDING DEPENDENT MEMBER

(1) After a Dependent Clause

In much the same class fall those parentheses which, being introduced by connectives, are not truly parenthetical[292]. When the introductory word is, as it usually is, *et*[293] or *nec*[294], it may be regarded as an intensive rather than a connective, though this is doubtful[295]; but

[290]Compare the tacit contrast between Atalanta's great speed and her even greater beauty, in Ovid, Metamorphoses 10.588–590 non secius ire sagitta Aonio visa est iuveni, *tamen* ille decorem miratur magis.

[291]There is the same kind of tacit contrast here (compare note 290). The gate that is less adorned—and Vergil appropriately bestows upon it language that is also less adorned—is after all, though so much less attractive and prominent, the means of egress for the true and useful dreams (even as, in The Merchant of Venice, it is the uninviting leaden casket, and not the gold or silver "hiding the grossness with fair ornament", that contains the prize—a parallel of which I am reminded by Professor Knapp). It might not be far-fetched or fanciful to see a certain harmony between thought and form of expression in the lines dealing with the two gates. In describing the plain, honest gate, Vergil uses the most simple, straightforward, logical method of description. When he comes to the superficial lure of the other gate, he presents a more elaborate description of its specious beauties, and closes with a line in which logic has given way to rhetoric—for *sed*, though less exact than *qua* would be, is certainly more effective (compare what was said above, notes 270 and 273, of *at*). Horace, it seems to me, proceeds in the same way in Carmina 1.38: the first strophe, describing the pomp and luxury that he spurns, is highly elaborate and artificial, with its alliteration and complicated word-order (both *rosa* and *locorum* transposed from their purely natural positions); while the second strophe possesses to the full the very simplicity that it lauds (compare Tennyson's studied plainness in his peasant tale of Dora). For other passages in which Vergil seems to adapt form to sense, see note 485.

[292]Compare what has been said above, 50 and 53, of three instances (8.99–100, 9.387–388, 12. 134–135) in each of which a clause that *may*, from the standpoint of logic, be parenthetical, is introduced by a correlative.

[293]As in E. 5.88–89 (cited on 72), G. 2.122–125 (74), 11.364–365 (74), 11.901 (75). Compare the use of *-que* in 3.615 (75–76).

[294]As in E. 3.102 (cited in note 307), 3.172–176 (note 307), 9.813–814 (note 307), 10.608 (74), 11.642–643 (74). Equally common is the use of *neque enim*, as in 1.198–199 (note 297), 6.367–370 (74), 7.580–582 (73), 9.702–704 (75); on this see note 297. *Necdum* occurs once, in 1.23–28 (75); on this see note 295, third paragraph.

[295]K.[1] in his Index cites three instances from the selections included in his edition, of *et* in the sense of 'even'. These are 2.49 timeo Danaos et dona ferentis, concerning which I think there can be little question, despite the opposition of Lachmann (on Lucretius 6.7); 5.851, which is a most vexed passage (see note 463); and 9.783, about which I should have my doubts (see below, 165). In such passages *et* seems to be stronger than *etiam* ('even'); it is at least equivalent to *quoque* ('also, too'), if it has not the full force of 'and'. Note the translation of E. 5.89 that C. gives *ad loc.*, "'aye, and he was very lovable,' or 'and he was very lovable too.'" Even in 2.49, the sense seems to be 'I fear the Greeks, when they bring gifts, too (as well as at other times)': but for a possible objection to this explanation, inasmuch as it involves an ellipsis, see below, note 297, fourteenth paragraph.

with *sed*, which occurs once[296], no such treatment is possible; and there seems to me to be no reason for us to deal with *et* and *nec* in a different

For *nec* in the sense of *non*—a meaning which it certainly appears to approach very closely in 9.813–814 and probably in E. 3.102 (for which see note 307)—, consult Otto Ribbeck's monograph, Beiträge zur Lehre von den Lateinischen Partikeln (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1869), which contains what Munro (on Lucretius 2.23) calls "the best account I know of this usage". Ribbeck (24) distinguishes two *neque*'s, the one a copulative, formed with the instrumental of the relative, the other an emphatic negative, formed with the instrumental of the indefinite. Ribbeck's view is accepted by Christian Karl Reisig and Friedrich Haase, Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft (volume 3, revised by J. H. Schmalz and G. Landgraf, Berlin, S. Calvary and Co., 1888): see note 406g on the two *-que*'s, and note 417 on the two *neque*'s. In contradistinction to this view is that expressed by J. B. Greenough in his highly interesting, and, to me at least, convincing, article on Some Uses of Neque (Nec) in Latin (in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 2.129–141). Greenough refuses to admit that there are two *neque*'s, and tries to work out a logical proof that in *neque* the connective force of *-que* is still at work, even when it seems to vanish altogether. This use of *neque* is precisely analogous to that of *et* dealt with at the beginning of this note. A good illustration in proof of Greenough's contention is 10.608 (cited on 74), which can be treated just as he handles his examples: 'as you thought, Venus—and you're not wrong, either'. (Such a rendering is doubtless more colloquial than the corresponding passage in Vergil; but it seems to provide the only method by which English can find a parallel for the Latin form of expression.) 10.608 is really the equivalent, cast in the negative, of E. 5.88–89. Both may be treated as examples of fusion (see 72–73, 74); but undoubtedly in each instance Vergil's not quite precise variant is far more emphatic than either of the thoroughly logical alternatives.

Necdum I believe to be always connective in Vergil. Some instances, of course, are surer than others: such are 3.665, 5.415, 5.608, 7.356, 8.697. The only really doubtful instance, I think, is E. 9.26 immo haec, quae Varo necdum perfecta canebat; and even here Greenough's method may be applied: 'Just see these lines which he was singing to Varus (how beautiful they are), and they aren't even finished yet either'.

However, in the combination *neque enim*, *neque* at times certainly approaches very closely—even more closely than in the two examples of simple *nec* cited two paragraphs back—to the meaning *non*. See note 297, third paragraph.

Finally, we must note two interesting passages in which *nec* seems to be used as the equivalent not of *non* but of *ne*. These are E. 9.6 hos illi (quod nec vertat bene) mittimus haedos, and E. 10.46–48 tu procul a patria (nec sit mihi credere tantum) Alpinas a, dura, nives et frigora Rheni me sine sola vides. In the first of these we may translate after Greenough's manner, 'And may it not turn out well for him either', and say that, while the relative *quod* is of course the true connective, represented by 'and . . . it', still there is, reinforcing it, so to speak, an additional connective element in *nec*, represented by 'not . . . either'. But nothing of this sort seems possible with the second instance. Therefore it is perhaps best to accept with respect to both passages P's. statement that "*nec* for *ne* is an archaism used in prayers and imprecations". C., strange to say, makes no comment whatsoever on the usage in either place. Haverfield with respect to the earlier instance adds a reference to Munro's note on Lucretius 2.23 (already mentioned in the second paragraph of the present note) as evidence that *nec* in E. 9.6 stands for *non*. (I myself think that *neque* in Lucretius stands for *et . . . non*. A résumé of my view of the entire vexed passage of Lucretius, 2.16–23, appears in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association 58. xxxiii–xxxiv.) But *non* with the optative subjunctive *vertat* seems to me as hard to explain as *nec*. In regard to the second of the instances, it is possible that Haverfield takes *nec* as a true connective, equivalent to *neve*, not to *ne*. He alters the punctuation, so that the line, which in the fourth edition had run tu procul a patria—nec sit mihi credere tantum!—, appears in the fifth edition as follows, tu procul a patria, nec sit mihi credere tantum! This rather looks as if Haverfield wishes to supply *es* with *tu procul a patria*, and to make a new sentence beginning with the follow-

manner from that in which we *must* handle *sed*, namely, as a co-ordinate conjunction[297].

---

ing line. Such a construction appears to me very weak and un-Vergilian, and the use of *nec* to join (*es*) and *sit* seems to me most unnatural, not in the least like the use of *-que* in 2.110 or in 3.614–615 (for which see, respectively, note 305 and pages 75–76). Rather than adopt Haverfield's view, I should far prefer to follow P. and take *nec* as equivalent to *ne*, difficult though that is. Professor Knapp tells me that he does not consider *nec* used for *ne* in either of the passages just discussed. In his opinion, E. 9.6 represents a fusion of *quod non bene vertet* and *nec (id) bene vertat* (which approaches my own suggestion with respect to the passage), and E. 10.46–47 involves a suppressed member, the sense being '(may I neither have to endure the Alps) nor (even) have to believe so strange a tale!' He explains Lucretius 2.23 also as involving a suppressed first member. On the use of *nec* for *ne*, see further the close of note 307. [296]In 6.83–84 (cited on 75).

[297]It may be objected that *neque enim* (for examples of which see note 294) is a subordinating rather than a coordinating conjunction. If so, then, though it is still not strictly in place in a parenthetical clause, its use to refer to a preceding dependent clause with which, because of the dependency just mentioned, the parenthetical clause cannot properly be *coordinated*, can no longer be regarded as an anomaly.

The situation is complicated by the fact that in this expression, the force of neither *neque* nor *enim* is absolutely clear. Several questions arise. Is *neque* connective or merely negative? Is *enim* connective or merely affirmative? And, if *enim* is connective, is it coordinating or subordinating in its force?

Concerning *neque*, it seems safe to say that, if this word is ever equivalent to *non* (see note 295, second paragraph), it has such equivalence when combined with *enim*. Compare G.-L., § 480, Note 4. See also what is said below, in the sixteenth paragraph of this note, concerning 6.367–370. It may be noted that *neque* seems particularly likely to be without connective force when the *neque enim* clause is interjected into the heart of the main clause, as, e. g., in 2. 376–377 dixit, et extemplo (neque enim responsa dabantur fida satis) sensit medios delapsus in hostis. (Compare below, note 307, on 9.813–814, where a *nec* clause similarly constitutes a complete interruption of the thought. There, too, *nec* seems to be equivalent to *non*. See again note 295, second paragraph.) On the other hand, I think that in some instances of the expression *neque enim*, the word *neque* may retain its connective force. Such force is surely present in 9.702–705 sternit . . . Bitian . . . , non iaculo (neque enim iaculo vitam ille dedisset), sed magnum stridens contorta phalarica venit. Indeed, it is present to such an extent that C. does not treat the clause as parenthetical, but views the passage as similar to 11.567–569 non illum tectis ullae, non moenibus urbes accepere, neque ipse manus feritate dedisset; pastorum et solis exegit montibus aevum. I think C. is wrong in not using parentheses in 9.704, for the clause *neque . . . dedisset* decidedly interrupts the march of the thought; but that does not alter the fact that in it *neque* used with *enim* has connective force.

Concerning *enim*, a vexed and disputed problem confronts us. Haverfield on G. 2.509, and K. on 1.19, indicate that in the passage concerned, as well as elsewhere, *enim* is used by Vergil in its earlier sense, which is affirmative, not causal. But students of early Latin differ on this point. William Ramsay, in his notes on the Mostellaria, edited by George S. Ramsay (London, Macmillan and Co., 1869), declares (206) that in the earlier writers *enim* is *always* causal. Peter Langen, in his Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1880), declares (262–263) that in Plautus *enim* is *never* causal. The mid-path is chosen by Willard K. Clement, in The Use of *enim* in Plautus and Terence (Baltimore, The Lord Baltimore Press, 1897), in which he concludes (6) that "in both Plautus and Terence *enim* has in the majority of cases an affirmative or corroborative force", but that (8–9) causal *enim* also undoubtedly exists in both these writers. As for *neque enim*, he cites (14–15) one instance from Plautus with corroborative force, two from Plautus and two from Terence with causal force. Professor Lodge places the stamp of his approval upon Clement's presentation by following it in his great Lexicon Plautinum, Volume 1, A-L (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1904–1924). However, the sentence quoted there from Clement, 8, "In the remaining

(a) Clause Introduced by a Relative Pronoun

When a parenthetical clause of the type just described follows a clause introduced by a relative, we have an illustration of much the

---

examples a causal force is possible, though a corroborative force can be given", represents not Clement's own view, but his summary of Langen's view, which he is combating. Clement, as I have said, is convinced that in a number of examples *enim must* be regarded as causal, *not* merely corroborative.

As for *enim* in an affirmative sense in Vergil, Haverfield not only classes G. 2.509 as an illustration thereof, but, in his note on this passage, cites as further examples G. 2.104, 6.317, 8.84, 10.874, and also the use of *enimvero*, *at enim*, and probably *sed enim*, as exemplified in 1.19, 2.164, etc. This list of illustrative passages falls naturally into three distinct groups: (1) examples of *enim* alone, (2) examples of *sed enim*, (3) examples of *neque enim* (Vergil does not use *enimvero* or *at enim*). Let us view these separately.

Enim alone occurs in G. 2.508–510 hunc plausus hiantem per cuneos geminatus enim plebisque patrumque corripuit; 6.317–318 Aeneas miratus enim motusque tumultu "dic" ait; 8.84–85 quam pius Aeneas tibi enim, tibi, maxima Iuno, mactat; 10.874–875 Aeneas agnovit enim laetusque precatur: "sic pater ille deum faciat, sic altus Apollo!..." In the first, the second, and the fourth of these, it is possible to assign a causal sense to *enim* if one uses parentheses. In the first, some editors, according to C. and P., make *geminatus enim* parenthetical; others, according to P., *geminatus enim plebisque patrumque*. In the second, K. makes *miratus enim motusque tumultu* parenthetical. In both these instances, of course *est* must then be supplied. In the fourth, Wagner makes *agnovit enim* parenthetical.

There is some difficulty in each of these cases. In the first, introduction of the parenthetical clause seems to me far-fetched and pointless. C. rejects the idea of such a procedure, though the other instances of Vergil's use of *enim* in a non-connective sense seem to him "not quite parallel".

In the second, the tenses of the verbs appear to me a little odd. The perfect participles are natural enough, to define an action begun before that of the main verb and continuing with it, or even in the sense of present participles (compare 167, 172-173, note 706); but if a finite verb is used, it seems to me that we should expect a present, if *ait* in the following line is present, or an imperfect, if *ait* is perfect. However, this is not a very serious objection. C. considers the possibility of using parentheses, but finally, with some hesitation, rejects it.

In the fourth instance, N. dismisses Wagner's view as "unnatural". I would go farther and call it impossible, for it seems to me that if *agnovit* is in a parenthesis, the use of *-que* after *laetus* is inexplicable. Wagner attempts to justify it in Q. V. 35.9 by listing this passage with others under the head "Per copulam interdum post plura interposita continuatur oratio." But of the other passages which he groups there, only G. 4.67 and 5.704–708 are in any way pertinent, since only in these has the connective nothing to connect. However, a study of both will, I think, reveal that neither is really pertinent.

In G. 4.67–70 sin autem ad pugnam exierint—nam saepe duobus regibus incessit magno discordia motu; continuoque animos vulgi et trepidantia bello corda licet longe praesciscere, there is an anacoluthon; but it is not of the same sort as would occur, according to Wagner's view, in 10.874. In G. 4.69 *-que* surely joins *licet* not with *exierint*, the verb preceding the parenthesis, but with *incessit*, the first (and by no means the only) verb within the parenthesis. C. well describes Vergil's manner of composition here by saying (on G. 4.67) that "he strikes at once into a parenthesis which swells into a regular description, forming a paragraph of itself, and we can only collect what the apodosis would have been from vv. 86, 87, and the following paragraph, where he returns from the bees to their owner". (C. might well have given a cross-reference to his similar note on a second rather complicated passage dealing with bees, G. 4. 251–259. For a discussion of another irregularity involved in this passage, see below, 79–80.) P's. comment in regard to 4.67–70 is similar to C's.; and both P. and H. punctuate much as C. does, using a dash after *exierint*, and thereafter only commas, semicolons, or colons.

same sort of inconcinnity as has been the subject of the previous pages (58–67).

The other passage, 5.704–708, runs as follows:

> tum senior Nautes, unum Tritonia Pallas
> quem docuit multaque insignem reddidit arte
> (haec responsa dabat, vel quae portenderet ira
> magna deum vel quae fatorum posceret ordo)—
> isque his Aenean solatus vocibus infit.

Here C. and K. are ready to admit that the use of *isque* in 708 involves an anacoluthon. But that, it seems to me, hardly gives us grounds for recognizing a similar anacoluthon in the use of *laetusque* in 10.874. In the first place, *laetusque* does not pick up *Aeneas* so readily as *isque* picks up *Nautes*. In the second place, Vergil would scarcely have altered the structure of a sentence so brief as the one coextensive with line 874. In the passage in the fifth book, there are present to lead him astray several factors, all of which are lacking in the other. One of these is the long and rather complicated parenthesis in 706–707, which could easily confuse the march of the thought in a way quite impossible for an interpolation of two words such as *agnovit enim*. The second disturbing element is the relative clause, itself almost parenthetical, which occupies a line and a half before the true parenthesis. Vergil might recall this relative clause but vaguely, and think of it as a main clause. Or he might in momentary confusion fancy that another relative clause was called for after the parenthesis, but choose to replace the *qui* needed to head it by *is*, in accordance with a quite possible usage (compare 41–47). This would be especially likely if he had, when writing the words *tum senior Nautes*, intended them to constitute in themselves a main clause. And that would be absolutely natural. A verb of saying can most readily be supplied with them. We may compare *tum Venus* in 1.335, *tum pater Anchises* in 6.713, etc. Indeed, it is possible that Vergil maintained this intention throughout the sentence, adding line 708 merely as a sort of resumptive clause parallel to *tum senior Nautes* (*loquitur*). Then he inserted *is* to recall *Nautes*, and to make clear that the subject of *infit* is *Nautes*, not *Pallas*, the subject of the verbs in both the relative clause and the parenthetical clause. In that case, there is no anacoluthon at all. Perhaps *is* is pleonastic, but *-que* is necessary. But nothing of the sort can be postulated with respect to 10.874, for the simple *Aeneas* is not at all comparable to *tum senior Nautes*, and could not possibly be thought of as the subject of an understood verb of saying, or of any verb at all other than *precatur*. It would be easier to say that *-que* is merely emphatic (compare note 295, first paragraph); but that seems uncalled-for here.

In short, only a forced interpretation can result from the use of parentheses in 10.874–875. This statement applies to G. 2.509 also. Such forced interpretations I see no reason for adopting, since it is quite possible to regard *enim* as non-connective, and therefore as demanding no parentheses. And this *is* quite possible, for it is inevitable, it seems to me, in 8.84–85. To be sure, C. suggests a special reason for the use of *enim* in this last passage, namely, that here as in Livy 22.25, "we have a sort of quotation of the words actually spoken". (But the text of the Livy passage, 22.25.3, has been questioned.)

To summarize with respect to the four examples of *enim* just discussed, we may note that only in regard to 6.317–318 does there seem to be much doubt as to the force of *enim*. There K. considers *enim* causal, and the clause in which it occurs parenthetical; and C. is not quite certain. In the other three instances, *enim* assuredly seems purely affirmative and non-connective. This is the view of C. and P. with respect to G. 2.508–510, of C. with respect to 8.84–85, of N. and K. with respect to 10.874–875.

We now turn to the use of *sed enim*. The instances that Haverfield cites are 1.17–20 hoc regnum dea gentibus esse, si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque. progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci audierat Tyrias olim quae verteret arces; and 2.162–170 omnis spes Danaum et coepti fiducia belli Palladis auxiliis semper stetit. impius ex quo Tydides sed enim scelerumque inventor Ulixes . . . corripuere sacram effigiem . . . , ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri spes Danaum, fractae vires, aversa deae mens. To these may be added 5.394–396 non laudis amor nec gloria cessit pulsa metu; sed enim gelidus tardante senecta sanguis hebet, and 6.27–29 hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error; magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambages-

E. 5.88–89 pedum, *quod*. . .non *tulit* Antigenes (*et erat* tum dignus amari)[298] may be treated as a fusion of *pedum, quod non tulit Antigenes* que resolvit. In all these passages it seems to me that we can find causal force in *enim* if we assume an ellipsis, much after the method adopted by Greenough in dealing with *neque* alone, on which see note 295. (Compare the way E. 1.27 is treated below, 134 and note 561.) The passages can be expanded as follows: (1) hoc regnum dea gentibus esse, si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque; *sed timet ne fata non sinant*, progeniem *enim* Troiano a sanguine duci audierat Tyrias olim quae verteret arces; (2) omnis spes Danaum et coepti fiducia belli Palladis auxiliis semper stetit; *sed haec auxilia perdita sunt*, impius ex quo Tydides *enim* scelerumque inventor Ulixes. . .corripuere sacram effigiem. . ., ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri spes Danaum, fractae vires, aversa deae mens; (3) non laudis amor nec gloria cessit pulsa metu; *sed cunctor*, gelidus *enim* tardante senecta sanguis hebet; (4) hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error; *sed Theseus pedem sospes reflexit* (to borrow from Catullus 64.112), magnum reginae *enim* miseratus amorem Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resolvit. In short, *sed enim* in each instance seems to me to present a combination of adversative and causal ideas. However, I am well aware that in thus expanding the passages, I am acting counter to the authoritative statement of many a scholar. We may compare Lewis Leaming Forman's pungent comment on ἀλλὰ γάρ, made in his Selections from Plato, Appendix, 420 (London, Macmillan and Co., 1906): "The elaboration of an ellipsis can only be defended by rote, not by reason. We were many of us taught that way." In this connection it is of interest to note that Professor Gonzalez Lodge, in a review of Herbert Charles Elmer's Latin Grammar, in The American Journal of Philology 50 (1929), 90–95, says (93): "...it seems undeniable that except in rare instances ellipsis is never to be assumed unless a definite word or words can be supplied." On the other hand, Professor Paul Shorey, in a paper called Illogical Idiom, in Transactions of the American Philological Association 47 (1916), 205–234, says (216): "Without resort to ellipse, there can be no valid explanation of the uses of ἀλλά, γάρ, ἐπεί, ὡς, and the particles generally...."

In the one example with *neque enim* cited by Haverfield, it is perhaps again possible to recognize an ellipsis. The passage is G. 2.103–104 sed neque quam multae species nec nomina quae sint est numerus; neque enim numero comprendere refert. This might be expanded to run thus: neque quam multae species nec nomina quae sint est numerus, *neque hoc refert*, numero *enim* comprendere non refert. Such fullness would be unnatural; but it is not really tautological. However, we obtain almost the same general meaning if we follow Haverfield and Page, and call *enim* merely emphatic here. Haverfield in his note on this passage compares 2.100 nec requievit enim, which he rather surprisingly omits from his list of parallel passages in his note on G. 2.509. The preceding sentence (2.97–99) runs as follows: hinc mihi prima mali labes, hinc semper Ulixes criminibus terrere novis, hinc spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas et quaerere conscius arma. At first sight it might seem that *enim* might be considered to have a causal relation with *hinc mihi prima mali labes*, but the interposition of the remainder of the sentence puts this out of the question. Here there does not seem to me to be the slightest possibility that the force of *enim* is anything but emphatic. It is perhaps worthy of note that the word follows *requievit*; we have not here the usual phrase *neque enim*.

Haverfield does not mention, nor does C. comment on, the very similar use, as it seems to me, of *enim* in 9.702–705 sternit...Bitian..., non iaculo (neque enim iaculo vitam ille dedisset), sed magnum stridens contorta phalarica venit (cited below, 75). Here *enim* might be said to indicate a causal relationship with respect to the circumstance that Turnus did not use a javelin against Bitias; this is evidently the view of K.², who translates *enim* by "for, verily". But to me it appears that, whereas, as has already been said (in the third paragraph of this note), *neque* is here very strongly connective in force, perhaps just *because neque* is so strongly connective, there is no connective element in *enim*. On the other hand, *enim* in a parenthetical clause seems to me decidedly causal in 6.367–370 tu, si qua via est, si quam tibi diva creatrix ostendit (neque enim, credo, sine numine divum flumina tanta paras Stygiamque innare paludem), da dextram misero (cited on 74). Here the parenthesis may be expanded thus: si qua via est, si quam tibi diva creatrix ostendit (*et diva certe viam ostendit*,

(*erat tamen tum dignus amari*) and *hoc pedum non tulit Antigenes* (*et erat tum dignus amari*).

7.580–582 tum *quorum* attonitae Baccho nemora avia *matres* insultant thiasis (*neque enim leve nomen* Amatae) undique collecti coeunt Martemque fatigant[299] is very similar.

---

sine numine divum *enim* flumina tanta *non* paras Stygiamque innare paludem). Thus even in a case of this sort, we can follow Greenough's method of dealing with *neque* (again compare note 295). But perhaps it would be simpler in this instance to treat *neque* as merely equivalent to *non*. At all events, there can be no doubt, I think, that here *enim* is causal.

Since the fact may now be assumed to be established that *enim* may be causal, i. e. connective, we may now consider the final question posited at the beginning of this note: is this connective *enim* coordinating or subordinating in its force? Like *for* in English, it seems to fluctuate between the two possibilities.

It assuredly seems to be a subordinating conjunction in an interesting example, G. 4.206–208 ipsas quamvis angusti terminus aevi excipiat (neque enim plus septima ducitur aestas), at genus immortale manet. Here the parenthetical clause is in a sort of explicative relation to the *quamvis* clause. That the two are not strictly coordinate or parallel is shown by the shift in mood. The clause... *quamvis*...*excipiat* is in adversative relation with *manet*. So, of course, in a way is the clause *neque enim*...*ducitur*..., but only indirectly: directly it is in causal relation with the clause...*quamvis*...*excipiat*. In other words, the relation is not 'although *a* is true, and (although) *b* is true, still *c* is true', but 'although *a* is true—(and *a* is true), for *b* is true—, still *c* is true'.

The same line of reasoning holds good in regard to another passage, already referred to in this note, 6.367–370 tu, si qua via est, si quam tibi diva creatrix ostendit (neque enim, credo, sine numine divum flumina tanta paras Stygiamque innare paludem), da dextram misero, where again the *neque enim* clause is in causal and therefore dependent relation to a clause which is itself dependent, a *si* clause this time. But there is this difference. In the former example, grammatically (except for the shift of mood, which is not unparalleled; compare 32–33) the *neque enim* clause *can* be made *coordinate* with the earlier, dependent clause, the *quamvis* clause, and in the same relation as it (adversative) to the main verb, *manet*; but in the latter example, grammatically the *neque enim* clause *cannot possibly* be made *coordinate* with the dependent clause, the *si* clause, because it *cannot* be placed in the same relation (conditional) with the main verb, *da*. Accordingly, unless the parenthesis is really *subordinate* to the *si* clause, the example belongs here, and it is therefore cited below (74), though with reservations.

There is one clear case, however, in connection with which *no* reservations are needed: 7.580–582 tum quorum attonitae Baccho nemora avia matres insultant thiasis (neque enim leve nomen Amatae) undique collecti coeunt Martemque fatigant (cited on 73). Here there can, I think, be no doubt that *neque enim* is absolutely coordinating in force. The parenthesis does *not* give the reason for the *quorum* clause, does *not* tell us that these warriors' women-folk are influenced by Amata's prestige to join in her revels—we knew that long before, as early as 7.392–393 fama volat, furiisque accensas pectore matres idem omnis simul ardor agit nova quaerere tecta. The parenthesis gives the cause of *coeunt* and *fatigant*, exactly as the *quorum* clause does; the only irregularity lies in the fact that the force of *quorum* does not hold in the *neque enim* clause (just as has been noted so often above, 58–67). C. makes the parallelism very clear in his note: "The authority of Amata combines with family sympathy to put the relatives of the matrons on the side of war."

On the other hand, in 1.198–199 o socii (neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum), o passi graviora, the force of *enim* seems definitely subordinating, whether we combine the *neque enim* clause with *o socii* (as does K., who explains the expression as elliptical), or with *o passi graviora* (as I should be inclined to do). If we accept the latter view, we can hardly see connective force in *neque*, which K. considers = *et non*. F.-B. explain *neque* much after the manner of Greenough (see note 295), saying, "*neque* almost = *non*, but strictly 'for not before this either,' etc."

[298]For C's. translation of this, see note 295.

[299]See note 297, penultimate paragraph.

Perhaps 11.364–365 ego, invisum *quem* tu tibi *fingis* (*et* esse nil *moror*) belongs here. But it may be that the clause *et. . .moror*, which H. makes parenthetical, is not really to be regarded as such, but is to be considered a second relative clause. See above, 48.

Likewise in 11.642–643 Herminium, nudo *cui* vertice fulva caesaries nudique umeri (*nec* vulnera *terrent*), the second clause perhaps is not to be set off by parentheses, but is to be regarded as a genuine parallel for the relative, with a second relative, *quem*, to be understood. Once more see above, 51–52.

(b) Clause Introduced by a Relative Adverb

Just as above (61–62) we placed clauses introduced by the relative adverb *unde* in much the same category as those introduced by a relative pronoun, so here, similarly, we may note a clause introduced by the relative adverb *ubi*, in G. 2.122–125 ⟨quid referam⟩ quos. . . gerit India lucos, extremi sinus orbis, *ubi* aëra vincere summum arboris haud ullae iactu *potuere* sagittae (*et gens illa* quidem sumptis non *tarda* pharetris)? Here the force of *et* is essentially what it is in E. 5.88–89.

(c) Clause Introduced by a Conjunction

From a clause introduced by a conjunctive adverb it is but a step to one introduced by a conjunction.

An example is 6.367–370 tu, *si* qua *via est*, *si* quam tibi *diva creatrix ostendit* (*neque enim*, credo, sine numine divum flumina tanta *paras* Stygiamque innare paludem), da dextram misero. But on this see note 297, especially the sixteenth paragraph.

A second example is 10.608 *ut rebare*, Venus (*nec* te sententia *fallit*)[300]. This represents a fusion of *ut rebare* (*non te sententia fallit*) and *hoc rebare* (*nec te sententia fallit*). With this we might be tempted to compare 12.188 *ut* potius *reor et* potius di numine *firment*; but there we probably have two perfectly parallel clauses[301], since in thought *ut* as well as *potius* assuredly, as K. says, belongs in both clauses.

(2) After a Dependent Word

On precisely the same principle as the combination of a parenthetical clause with a dependent *clause* is that of a parenthetical clause with a dependent *word*[302]. This dependent word may be either an adjectival or an adverbial modifier.

[300]See note 295. [301]Except for the difference in mood. On that see 33.

[302]The examples listed here, like G. 3.108–109 (cited on 81), of course do not in strictness belong in a section devoted to 'non-parallel clauses'. Those grouped under (a) belong rather with the instances catalogued on 129–139, of combinations of adjectives and clauses; and those grouped under (b) belong rather with the instances catalogued on 87–100, of combinations of nouns and clauses—indeed, one of them, 9.702–705, will be found there, on 88 and again on 99. But it should

(a) Adjectival Modifier

1′. *ADJECTIVE*

In the first class we must list G. 2.238–241 if we follow Ribbeck's punctuation[303], which makes the passage run as follows: salsa autem tellus et quae perhibetur amara, frugibus *infelix* (ea *nec mansuescit* arando, nec Baccho genus aut pomis sua nomina servat), tale dabit specimen.

To the same class belongs 1.23–28 id *metuens* veterisque *memor* Saturnia belli, prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis (*necdum* etiam *causae* irarum saevique *dolores exciderant* animo; *manet* alta mente repostum *iudicium* Paridis spretaeque *iniuria* formae et *genus* invisum et rapti Ganymedis *honores*). The parenthesis here is summed up in the following line by the words *his accensa super*, which constitute a surplusage amounting almost to an anacoluthon.

2′. *PARTICIPLE*

In the foregoing passage the parenthesis is made parallel to the participle *metuens* as well as to the adjective *memor*. In two other instances we find parentheses made parallel to participles: 6.83–84 pelagi *defuncte* periclis (*sed* terrae *graviora manent*), and 11.901 ille *furens* (*et* saeva Iovis sic *numina poscunt*).

(b) Adverbial Modifier

To the second class we may assign one example, or possibly two, in which the adverbial modifier takes the form of an ablative.

1′. *ABLATIVE OF MEANS*

The instance about which there can be no doubt is 9.702–704 sternit. . .Bitian. . . , non *iaculo* (*neque enim* iaculo vitam *ille dedisset*)[304]. The ablative is instrumental.

2′. *ABLATIVE OF CAUSE*

With the example just cited we may compare 3.614–615 Troiam *genitore* Adamasto *paupere* (*mansissetque* utinam fortuna!)[305] pro-

be remarked that this example is listed there because of the coordination with the ablative *iaculo* of a genuinely parallel *sed* clause, not because of the parenthetical *neque enim* clause; and the passages where the clause copulated with the dependent member *is*, in spite of such copulation, to be viewed as parenthetical, it seems far more pertinent and convenient to treat in a group no matter whether the afore-mentioned dependent member is likewise a clause, as in the examples on 67–74, or is merely a word, as in the examples to be presented here (74–77). Compare note 151.

[303]However, I feel quite convinced by C's. arguments in favor of beginning the parenthesis with *frugibus*—a method of pointing adopted also by P. and H. C. speaks of the "metrical harshness" resulting (in line 239) as "not unpleasing as a variety". This appears to me rather a begging of the question; I would rather suggest that the harshness may be deliberate, as appropriate to the sense of the line (compare note 485).

[304]Already referred to, in note 302.

[305]The parenthetical clause in 2.110 is very similar, but it is connected in thought with an independent, not a dependent, word. On the passage see above, 33.

fectus, if the ablative is to be regarded as causal; and even if, as the editors say, the ablative is really absolute[306], still this example is sufficiently like the preceding one to be compared with it.

This last example is rather peculiar in that the parenthesis is imbedded in the heart of a clause, temporarily interrupting the flow of the thought, which would have been simpler and smoother had *mansissetque utinam fortuna* followed instead of preceding *profectus*[307]. Had

[306]On the relation between an absolute ablative and a dependent ablative, compare note 500.

[307]We find the march of the thought similarly interrupted in 9.813–814 piceum (*nec* respirare *potestas*) flumen agit. As the words stand, it is hard to find anything at all with which to coordinate the parenthesis—whence the statement, note 295, that *nec* here seems very much like *non*. On the other hand, had the clause *nec respirare potestas* followed *agit*, the connection would have been perfectly straightforward and regular. Here, too, the broken order of words is perhaps meant to reflect the situation—the agonizing exhaustion of Turnus (see note 309). Perhaps Aeneas's excitement is similarly mirrored in the still more difficult passage 3.172–176 talibus attonitus visis et voce deorum (nec sopor illud erat, sed coram agnoscere vultus...videbar; tum...manabat...sudor), corripio e stratis corpus. Here it is probably simplest to consider *nec* equivalent to *neque enim*, as K. does. C. takes refuge in the view that the parenthesis introduces an anacoluthen.

We may compare also one other possible instance of a *nec* clause which interrupts the flow of the thought: E. 3.102 hi certe (neque amor causa est) vix ossibus haerent. Again it would be simpler could we alter the order, and read *hi certe vix ossibus haerent, neque amor causa est*. Psychologically, there seems less reason here than in the other two examples for the disturbance of natural word-order; but perhaps we can find an explanation in the fact that Menalcas wishes to show as early as possible in his couplet its connection with the preceding one that he aims to cap. The last line uttered by Damoetas has had to do with love, as affecting his herd, so Menalcas naturally points out almost immediately the contrasting condition that prevails in his flock.

Here it is by no means necessary to regard *nec* as equivalent to *non*. We can recognize in it connective force. Perhaps we should say that it stands for *sed non* rather than for *et non*; but a choice between *et* and *sed*, especially when the idea is negative, often depends merely on the point of view. Thus we can probably say here either 'These certainly—*but* in their case love is not the cause', or 'These certainly—*and* love is not the cause *either*'.

We must not fail to observe that there exists concerning this line another view which would deprive *nec* of any connective force. The MSS. have *his*, not *hi*. Unless we are willing to accept Donatus's doubtful statement (Commentum Terenti, Eunuchus 269) that *his* here is an archaism for *hi*, we must, if we do not wish to emend, accept C's. pointing, and read: his certe neque amor causa est; vix ossibus haerent. Then *nec* might be taken as *non*; but there is more point in the interpretation of C., who views it as equivalent to *ne...quidem*. Whichever meaning is to be accepted, the late position of *neque* seems odd to me. It is not duplicated in the passages cited as parallels by Wagner and by C. himself, which are, respectively, Cicero, Tusculanae Disputationes 1.65 quo nec in deo quidquam maius intelligi potest, and Horace, Sermones 2.3.262–263 nec nunc, cum me vocet ultro, accedam? (The second passage offered as a parallel by Wagner, Pliny, Naturalis Historia 17.28, may, I think, be wholly disregarded, as being too late to be pertinent.) Moreover, the validity of both these passages as parallels may well be questioned. In the citation from Cicero, the text is open to debate: see note 417 in Reisig-Haase (cited in note 295, second paragraph), and the various modern editions, e. g. the Teubner Text, edited by C. F. W. Mueller, who reads ne in deo quidem quicquam. In the citation from Horace, I am by no means sure that *nec* has the meaning of 'not even' attributed to it. A cursory reading of the Terentian model that Horace is copying may make us think it has;

such been the case, we might have said that here, as in the three instances discussed above (75), the parenthesis was made parallel with a participle (*profectus*)[308]. Doubtless the jerkiness of the mode of expression accentuates the anguish of the speaker[309].

c. CLAUSE COORDINATED WITH ANOTHER CLAUSE WITH WHICH IT IS LOGICALLY COORDINATED ONLY IN PART

We may note further a group of passages not dissimilar in type to those heretofore under discussion (58–77), but harder to sum up under a single head. In each of these passages a clause, *c*, is coordinated with a preceding clause, *b*, with which in sense *c* cannot

---

a more careful reading will make us doubt. Terence (Eunuchus 46–47) runs thus: quid igitur faciam? non eam ne nunc quidem quom accersor ultro? At first glance, we may fancy that Horace's *nec nunc* is to be taken as corresponding to, and therefore synonymous with, Terence's *ne nunc quidem*. But then there is no negative left in Horace to correspond to Terence's *non*. I am inclined to believe that Horace uses *nunc* alone, placed in an emphatic position almost at the beginning of his sentence, in place of Terence's *ne nunc quidem*, and that *nec* belongs with *accedam*, the two standing for Terence's *non eam*. By this I do not mean that *nec* has the sense of *non*. On the contrary, I would assign to *nec* its full connective force. It is natural that Horace should begin his dialogue with something of the sort, to give the impression of a continuation of earlier speech. Terence gets the same effect in *his* opening sentence (not reproduced by Horace) by the use of *igitur*. I believe that we may safely assume that Horace is copying Terence as closely as possible, since he is really engaging in a *tour de force* in thus turning iambic senarii into dactylic hexameters. Thus the note of caution that I sound elsewhere (notes 181 and 1138) with respect to the acceptance of arguments based on connection between originals and imitations does not apply here.

If Horace as a witness for the use of *nec* in the sense of *ne...quidem* is thus ruled out, C. loses his one strong argument. Vergil himself has the usage nowhere else, as Munro on page 270 of the review cited in note 281 points out in criticism of C's. conclusion. Despite this criticism, C. maintained his early opinion in later editions. H., except for the trivial difference of using dashes instead of parentheses, accepts the reading favored by Munro; and P. regards it as probably correct, though, strange to say, he follows C's. view in his text.

The one point in C's. favor that occurs to me, aside from the fact that the lection which he is supporting is the only one found in the codices, is the circumstance that the passage in question occurs in the Eclogues. In these poems Vergil's usage with respect to *nec* seems much less regular than in the works of his maturity. It is perhaps not pure coincidence that the two instances of his use of *nec* for *ne* (cited in the last paragraph of note 295) are both from the Eclogues, as is also the one possible example of *necdum* in a non-connective sense (see the third paragraph of the same note). But it must be noted that in Vergil's early writings it is more natural to find *nec* equivalent to *ne* than to find it equivalent to *ne...quidem*, since the former use belongs to early Latin, and the latter is a later development. See Stolz-Schmalz[5], who accept *nec* as an archaism in E. 9.6 (640), and refuse to take *nec* as = *ne...quidem* in E. 3.102, saying that this usage does not occur so early (641).

[308]But then the implied contrast would have been a little different, as indicating an antithesis between the alteration in Achaemenides's state that he brought about by changing his abode, and the permanence in that state that he now wishes he had maintained; whereas, as the text stands, the antithesis is rather between the supposed privations of his former lot, and his present regret that he did not adhere thereto.

[309]For other effective uses of appropriate word-order, see note 485.

be coordinated because *c* does not bear the same relation as *b* to some special member, *a*, which may either introduce or itself precede *b*. All these examples are produced by fusion; all may be reduced to a single formula, for each consists, roughly, of three illogically combined members, *a* + *b* + *c*, of which either the combination *a* + *b* alone or the combination *b* + *c* alone would be quite satisfactory[310].

A very simple example of this type is G. 2.527–531 *ipse* dies *agitat* festos, fususque per herbam. . . , te libans, Lenaee, *vocat* pecorisque magistris velocis iaculi certamina *ponit* in ulmo, corporaque agresti *nudant* praedura palaestra. Here, in terms of our formula, *ipse* is *a*, *dies. . .ulmo* is *b*, *corpora. . .palaestra* is *c*. In other words, *ipse*, which logically ought to be carried through the whole sentence, is not applicable all the way. The change of subject in 531 is very sudden; the passage would have been smoother as well as more logical if Vergil, instead of using *-que*[311], had employed a subordinating causal connective such as *qua de causa* or *quam ob rem*, or had inserted *qui*, referring to *magistris* of 529.

The part played by *ipse* in the preceding example is played by the phrase *non aliam ob culpam* in G. 2.380–389

non aliam ob culpam Baccho caper omnibus aris
caeditur et veteres *ineunt* proscaenia ludi,
praemiaque ingeniis pagos et compita circum
Thesidae *posuere*, atque inter pocula laeti
mollibus in pratis unctos *saluere* per utres;
nec non Ausonii, Troia gens missa, coloni
versibus incomptis *ludunt* risuque soluto,
oraque corticibus *sumunt* horrenda cavatis,
et te, Bacche, *vocant* per carmina laeta, tibique
oscilla ex alta *suspendunt* mollia pinu.

The phrase *non aliam ob culpam* is felt, not with all the verbs, as, on a first reading of the sentence, we are inclined to expect it to be, but only with *caeditur* (381). The idea in *et. . .ineunt. . .ludi* (381) might more logically be expressed by a dependent clause[312] such as *priusquam ineunt. . .ludi* or *qua re facta, ineunt. . .ludi*; and the other

[310]A further example of this type of fusion is 12.319–322, cited and commented on below (136), in which member *b* is probably to be treated as a participle when combined with *a*, and as a finite verb when combined with *c*. For a very similar example of much the same sort of inexact fusion, with a noun instead of a clause as the common member, see 50 and note 206, on 8.99–100.

[311]This *-que* virtually = *itaque*. See K's. Introduction, K.[1] § 199, K.[2] § 219, and the examples listed in the Index in K.[1] under *-que* 2 (page 572). Granted that Vergil chose to use this conjunction, he might have softened the harshness by inserting *illi* as subject of *nudant*: compare *illae* in G. 2.210 (quoted on 61) and *illa* in G. 4.513 (quoted on 62).

[312]We cannot follow our usual formula and employ the ablative absolute (compare 62), since, although *ineuntibus. . .ludis* would give the proper logical relationship so far as subordination goes, the tense of the participle would not be accurate. Compare note 268.

clauses should likewise be subordinated in some way. Heyne's attempt to harmonize the sentence by understanding *caprum* with *praemia* in 382, while in itself an interpretation quite to the point, and appropriate with *utres* also, is vain, since he, as C. points out, cannot explain away the introduction of *veteres. . . ludi* (381)[313], or the digression beginning with 385, *nec non* etc., where Bacchus is still referred to, but the goat is absolutely forgotten[314].

Comparable to *non aliam ob culpam* is *non dubiis. . .signis* in G. 4. 251–259[315]

> si vero, quoniam casus apibus quoque nostros
> vita tulit, tristi languebunt corpora morbo—
> quod iam *non dubiis* poteris cognoscere *signis*:
> *continuo est* aegris alius color; horrida vultum
> *deformat* macies; *tum* corpora luce carentum
> *exportant* tectis et tristia funera ducunt;
> *aut* illae pedibus conexae ad limina *pendent*
> *aut* intus clausis *cunctantur* in aedibus omnes
> ignavaeque fame et contracto frigore pigrae.

Here the words *continuo. . .macies* are perfectly in place after 253 (*quod. . .signis*): they indicate two of the sure symptoms of disease among the bees, others of which are added in 257–259 (*aut illae. . . pigrae*). Also, the words *tum. . .ducunt* are perfectly in place after *continuo. . .macies*: the entire progress[316] of the disease in the individual bee[317], beginning with an unhealthy color and ending with death, is traced here. Thus the words *continuo. . .macies*, the common member, form the connecting link between two members that really do not belong together, since the carrying out of the dead, as C. says, "can hardly be called a symptom of disease", even though it doubtless is a sign that something is amiss within the hive. However, since it *is* such a sign, the *tum* clause in its present form certainly fits in more smoothly than would a more logical variant, *tum moriuntur* or *tum luce privantur* or the like, which would have kept

[313]Even if we are very much to stress the idea of the etymological derivation of *τραγῳδία*, we can hardly suppose that Vergil meant to attribute the performance to the goat's misdeeds! Compare note 314.

[314]To be sure, it is possible to view all the customs referred to, both Greek and Italian, as in the nature of propitiatory rites on man's part to atone for the evil-doing of the goat; but this view strikes me as rather far-fetched, especially as there is, so far as I know, nothing whatsoever in the Fescennine festivals (apparently referred to in 385–386) or in the *ora* of 387 or the *oscilla* of 389, that has any direct connection with the goat.

[315]Referred to again in note 825.

[316]Note *continuo* (254) and *tum* (255). For the former see Haverfield's note on G. 1.356.

[317]Note that 257–259 refer rather to the effects of the disease on the community: the bees collectively hang in a cluster in the doorway, or huddle together within.

up the narrative in terms of the ailing bees instead of in terms of the way fellow-members of the community, who seem to be still untouched by the disease, deal with the dead. The shift to the surviving bees as subject perhaps paves the way for the reference to them in the next three verses (257–259). Despite this fact, however,[318] it cannot be gainsaid that these verses, referring to bees alive even though already affected with the disease, come in a little oddly after the reference to death, which seems as if it ought to have been reserved for a climax. The same objection applies to the position of verse 260, tum sonus auditur gravior, tractimque susurrant, where the presence of a second *tum* seems to me to add to the confusion, whether the word is used in the sense of *deinde*, as the first *tum* (255) certainly is, or in that of *eo tempore*. It may be noted that all the points enumerated in these last four lines (257–260 *aut illae. . . susurrant*) belong logically under the general heading of symptoms of disease, and thus resume the catalogue broken off by the clause *tum. . .ducunt*.

There is a somewhat similar interruption, not constituted by a *tum* clause but following a *tum* clause, in G. 1.277–286

. . . quintam <diem> fuge: pallidus Orcus
Eumenidesque *satae*: *tum* partu Terra nefando
Coeumque Iapetumque *creat* saevumque Typhoea
et coniuratos caelum rescindere fratres.
ter *sunt conati* imponere Pelio Ossam
scilicet, atque Ossae frondosum involvere Olympum:
ter pater exstructos *disiecit* fulmine montis.
septima post decimam felix et ponere vitem
et prensos domitare boves et licia telae
addere. nona fugae melior, contraria furtis.

Verses 281–283 (*ter. . .montis*) interrupt the thought, since they do not depend on *tum* (278). It is not enough to punctuate them as a separate sentence, as do C., H., and P.; they should be enclosed within parentheses. Logically, *sunt conati* should be introduced by *qui*, while the *disiecit* clause (283) cannot be fitted into the scheme at all, unless we insert *quos* with *montis* (which is objectionable, since *disiecit* ought to be coordinate with *sunt conati*).

A slightly different type of irregularity is presented by 3.420–425

dextrum *Scylla* latus, laevum implacata *Charybdis*
obsidet, atque imo barathri ter gurgite vastos
sorbet in abruptum fluctus rursusque sub auras
erigit alternos, et sidera *verberat* unda.
at *Scyllam* caecis *cohibet* spelunca latebris
ora exsertantem et navis in saxa trahentem.

[318] And despite the fact pointed out in note 317.

Here the balance—of *dextrum latus* (*obsidet*) with *Scylla*, and *laevum* (*latus*) *obsidet* with *Charybdis*[319]—is spoiled by the following words *atque. . .unda*; these words are applicable only to *Charybdis*, and, with the subject *Charybdis* repeated or replaced by *haec*, should constitute a new sentence to balance *at Scyllam. . .trahentem*.

G. 3.108–109 iamque *humiles*, iamque *elati* sublime videntur aëra per vacuum *ferri* atque *adsurgere in auras* is so similar to the previous example that it is listed here with it, although it does not properly belong in a section devoted to non-parallel clauses[320]. Here *humiles* and *elati*, like *Scylla* and *Charybdis* in the preceding example, properly balance each other; but the balance is destroyed by the addition of *ferri. . .auras*, which belongs in sense only with the second, and should be altered to some such form as *lati*(?)[321] *atque adsurgentes*[322]. We may say instead that *humiles* stands for *humiles ferri* and balances not *elati* but *elati. . .ferri*. This is made easier if, with C., we place a comma after *ferri*. However, this comma, though it may obscure, still cannot obviate, the essential difficulty, which is that the second infinitive, *adsurgere in auras*, cannot belong with *humiles* (*videntur*) but can be associated only with *elati. . .videntur*, and if we apply the first infinitive (*ferri*) to *humiles*, we should surely deal likewise with the second (*adsurgere*) also—so that we still have a breach of strict logic. We may say that there is a fusion of *iamque humiles videntur ferri* (or better, simply *humiles feruntur*[323]), *iamque elati sublime*

---

[319]Note that Vergil omits one important element with each member—the verb with the first, the object with the second. This is a favorite device of Horace's: observe e. g. Carmina 1.11.4 seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam; and see Clement Lawrence Smith's edition of the Odes and Epodes[2], Introduction, § 120 (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1903).

[320]Compare note 302.

[321]The *past* participle seems the only possibility for this theoretical substitute; but it is none the less highly unsatisfactory, in spite of what was said on 31, and of the examples cited on 31 and 173–174. For in these passages, except 12.781 (see 31), where the fact that the verb involved is a deponent may make a difference (compare K.[1], Introduction, § 171), the past participle indicates a *present state* that is the *result* of a *past action*, and not an actual process continuing into the present.

[322]Perhaps Sophocles, Antigone 1279–1280 *τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε φέρων, τὰ δ'ἐν δόμοις ἔοικας ἥκειν καὶ τάχ' ὄψεσθαι κακά* is a little like this example. There, too, we get a complementary infinitive (*ὄψεσθαι*) after a verb of seeming (*ἔοικας*) where a second participle to balance a preceding participle (*φέρων*) would seem to be demanded. But the Greek passage is much easier than the Latin, since there really occurs an infinitive (*ἥκειν*) for which *ὄψεσθαι*, without any serious breach of logic, can serve as a coordinate, if only the confusion in word-order, which constitutes the main difficulty, is remedied by a recasting of the passage as follows:—*τὰ μὲν πρὸ χειρῶν τάδε φέρων* (*ἔοικας*) *ἥκειν, τὰ δ'ἐν δόμοις ἔοικας τάχ' ὄψεσθαι κακά*. Of course, *καί* is omitted in this version, its place being taken by *δ'*, which now serves as a connective as well as a correlative.

[323]For this see below, 82.

videntur ferri atque adsurgentes in auras, and *elati sublime videntur aëra per vacuum ferri atque adsurgere in auras*. The trouble could have been avoided most simply if Vergil had given *humiles* a verb of its own, an infinitive with *videntur* understood, parallel to *ferri* and *adsurgere*, or, better still, a finite verb parallel to *videntur*, since those who drive on bent low (*humiles*) are engaging in an actual, not merely an apparent, performance. But in that case we should have lost the effect of rapid movement and sudden change produced by the contrast and the condensation inherent in the words *iamque humiles, iamque elati*.

Again Vergil was probably intent mainly on producing a rhetorically effective sense of contrast[324] in 4.176–177 parva metu primo[325], *mox* sese *attollit* in auras *ingredituru*que solo et caput inter nubila *condit*. The verb *ingreditur* is not truly parallel with *attollit* and *condit*, since it describes an action constantly true of Fama at all stages (including the initial period when she is *parva*) and not associated only with *mox*[326]. Logic demands rather *mox sese attollit et, ingrediens solo, caput inter nubila condit*; but logic would gain at the expense of vigor and picturesqueness, since the fine antithesis would be partially destroyed.

In much the same way two verbs are introduced where they are logically out of place in 12.378–382 *ibat* et auxilium. . .*petebat*, cum rota. . .*impulit effundit*que solo, Turnusque. . .*abstulit* ense caput truncumque *reliquit*. Except for the difference in tense[327], *abstulit* and *reliquit* form perfect parallels to *impulit* and *effundit*; but both, especially *reliquit*, are out of place in the *cum inversum* clause modifying *ibat* and *petebat*[328].

With the *cum* clause of the preceding example we may compare the *quantum* clause in 7.251–254 nec purpura regem picta *movet* nec sceptra *movent* Priameia *tantum quantum* in conubio natae thalamoque *moratur*, et veteris Fauni *volvit* sub pectore sortem. The comparison involved in *tantum. . .quantum* applies only to *movet. . .movent* and *moratur*, not to *volvit*. If, as C. convincingly maintains, the clause *et*. . .

---

[324]Note that *parva* is contrasted with *sese attollit in auras, primo* with *mox, ingreditur. . .solo* with *caput inter nubila condit*.

[325]On the additional irregularity involved in *parva metu primo*—an irregularity of much the same type as that under consideration here (compare notes 285 and 310)—see below, 133.

[326]See 171. [327]On this see 24.

[328]In the true, not inverted, expression of temporal relations, we should have a much more logical sentence, as follows: cum ibat et auxilium petebat <or cum iret et auxilium peteret> rota. . .impulit effunditque solo; Turnusque < = et tum Turnus or et deinde Turnus> abstulit ense caput truncumque reliquit.

sortem (254) represents part of the same thoughts as 251–253, and accordingly must not be separated therefrom by any stop lengthier than a comma, it seems tacked on rather illogically, unless it is parallel with *nec. . .movet* and *nec. . .movent*. This, however, seems unlikely, for the sense appears to link it rather with *moratur*. As a matter of fact, the clauses *nec. . .movet nec. . .movent. . .tantum* and *quantum. . . moratur* are not themselves perfectly correlated. They indicate a certain fusion, and the whole sentence might be more logically though less picturesquely recast either as *nec purpura movet nec sceptra movent tantum quantum conubium natae thalamusque* (*movent*) *et veteris Fauni sors* (*quam volvit sub pectore*) or as *nec in purpura nec in sceptris tantum moratur quantum in conubio natae thalamoque et in veteris Fauni sorte* (*quam volvit sub pectore*).

d. CLAUSES COORDINATED IN WHICH THERE IS A SHIFT IN STRUCTURE

(1) Variety instead of Balance

A lack of parallel structure such as we noticed just above may pervade an entire sentence.

Thus G. 3.112 *tantus amor* laudum, *tantae* est victoria *curae*, which as it stands presents a pleasing variety, would, if strict balance prevailed, run *tantus amor laudum, tanta est victoriae cura*. The form *victoriae*, it may be noted, presents metrical difficulties (compare 4).

In 11.642–643 Herminium, *nudo* cui *vertice* fulva caesaries *nudi*que *umeri*, the words *nudi. . .umeri* are parallel in syntax to *fulva caesaries*, in thought to *nudo. . .vertice*. This discrepancy will be discussed in greater detail below (note 687).

There is an almost imperceptible shift in 4.138–139 cui pharetra *ex auro*, crines nodantur *in aurum*, *aurea* purpuream subnectit fibula vestem. Absolute parallelism would demand at least the alteration of the last clause to *aurea purpurea subnectitur fibula vestis*[329]. (The ablative *aurea*, like *victoriae* above, is inconvenient metrically.)

The change is more marked in the rather similar passage, 1.446–449 templum. . . , *aerea* cui gradibus surgebant limina nexaeque *aere* trabes, foribus cardo stridebat *aënis*. This would have to be reconstructed as follows: *aerea cui surgebant limina nexaeque aere trabes, fores quibus cardo stridebat*[330] *erant aënae*.

[329]On the variation in voice, compare 19. The shift from ablative modifier to subject is paralleled by the shift from subject to ablative modifier in 10.858–860 *hoc* decus illi, *hoc* solamen erat, bellis *hoc* victor abibat omnibus (already cited in another connection in note 158).

[330]Or fores cardine stridentes; compare 6.573–574 stridentes cardine. . .portae.

We may compare the similar loss in balance and gain in variety produced by the same factors (introduction of a new verb, change in structure, and slight variation in the repeated word) in 4.182–183 *tot* vigiles oculi subter. . . , *tot* linguae, *totidem* ora sonant, *tot* subrigit auris.

We get a shift of the same kind in 7.328–329 *tot* sese vertit in ora, *tam saevae* facies, *tot* pullulat atra colubris, which would lose in force as well as in concision if it were resolved into a succession of parallel clauses thus: *tot* (*sunt*) *ora in quae sese vertit, tam saevae facies, tot colubri quibus pullulat atra.*

Very like the passage just cited is 7.447–448 *tot* Erinys sibilat hydris *tanta*que se facies aperit.

In E. 6.79–81 *quas* illi Philomela *dapes*, *quae dona* pararit, *quo cursu* deserta petiverit et *quibus*. . . volitaverit *alis*, *quo cursu* and, still more decidedly, *quibus*. . .*alis* fail to balance *quas*. . .*dapes* and *quae dona*. The two interrogatives should, I think, be replaced by one, *qualis*, since the point is the change in form of Philomela. C., however, suggests *quo modo* (as an equivalent for *quibus*), comparing E. 6.43. If he is right, I would add as a parallel the use of the interrogative adjectives in 9.399–400 (discussed at the close of note 61).

We have already (note 93) observed the shift in point of view found in 5.461–462 tum pater Aeneas *procedere* longius *iras* et *saevire* animis *Entellum* haud passus acerbis, which logically should run either *procedere iris et saevire animis Entellum* or *procedere iras et saevire animos Entelli*.

As the change from the subject *iras*, an abstract noun indicating a quality, to the subject *Entellum*, a concrete noun indicating the possessor of the quality, reflects a shift in point of view, so does the change from the subject *una acies iuvenum*, representing a troop of boys led, to *alter Atys* and *extremus*. . .*Iulus*, representing the persons leading[331]. This change occurs in a rather lengthy passage, 5.563–572,

> *una acies iuvenum*, ducit quam parvus ovantem
> nomen avi referens Priamus, tua clara, Polite,
> progenies, auctura Italos, quem Thracius albis
> portat equus bicolor maculis, vestigia primi
> alba pedis frontemque ostentans arduus albam;
> *alter Atys*, genus unde Atii duxere Latini,
> parvus Atys pueroque puer dilectus Iulo;
> *extremus* formaque ante omnis pulcher *Iulus*
> Sidonio est invectus equo, quem candida Dido
> esse sui dederat monimentum et pignus amoris.

[331]On the coordination of the troop and individual leaders, see 194.

In this description of the original Ludus Troiae, in which beautifully-bedecked youths executed complicated, even Labyrinthine manoeuvers[332], an elaborate form of description, characterized by variety and complexity[333], is highly appropriate.

(2) False Antithesis

There is, apparently, a false antithesis in G. 3.162–164 *cetera* pascuntur viridis armenta per herbas; *tu* quos ad studium atque usum formabis agrestem iam vitulos hortare. The second clause is certainly in adversative relation with the first[334], and, as C. says, the emphatic *tu* may serve as "quasi-adversative, standing in a sort of illogical opposition" to *cetera*. "Illogical" this opposition surely is, for it is not *tu*, but *hos* or *eos*, that we need in contrast to *cetera*. P., although he recognizes the adversative relation of the two clauses[335], thinks that *tu* is used mainly for didactic emphasis, like *tu* in 73[336]. But if that is Vergil's sole reason for emphasizing *tu*, he certainly starts us off on a false track; he ought to postpone *tu* till after the clause *quos. . .agrestem*. I am inclined to think that Vergil did have a logical antithesis implicit in his mind, but did not work it out in its full force. He may have meant something of this sort: 'the rest (*cetera*) may safely be left to themselves; all they need is to graze in the fields, without interference of any kind; but *you* (*tu*) must do your share in the rearing of the animals that you destine for labor.' That is, the opposition is not, as we should expect, between the two classes of cattle, (1) those designed for breeding and for sacrifice, and (2) those designed for labor; but it is between the agents to be active in each case, (1) the cattle themselves, if they are designed for breed-

---

[332]For their fine attire, note verses 553–559. For their complicated manoeuvers, note 580–595, especially 588–591, wherein their movements are compared with the windings of the Labyrinth.

[333]On Vergil's use of variety to avoid monotony in lengthy enumerations, see note 358, and also compare C's. note on 5.569. On Vergil's adaptation of form to sense, see note 485.

[334]Heyne's objection to the association of G. 3.162 with what follows because one expects *at* before *quos* is answered by C's. citation of 9.224–227 cetera. . . animalia somno laxabant curas. . . : ductores Teucrum. . . consilium. . . habebant. But the latter passage will not throw any light on the inconcinnity of the present one, since there *cetera. . . animalia* and *ductores Teucrum* are in perfect balance.

[335]Compare his paraphrase, "the rest of the herd. . . may be left to graze, but those that are to be used for ploughing must be taken in hand at once".

[336]Lines 73–74 run as follows: tu modo, quos in spem statues summittere gentis, praecipuum iam inde a teneris impende laborem. Compare further G. 2.241–242 tu spisso vimine qualos colaque prelorum fumosis deripe tectis, and G. 4. 106–107 tu regibus alas eripe. We may observe also the not dissimilar use of *illae* in G. 4.257 (quoted on 79), together with P's. notes on this passage and on G. 3.216–217.

ing and for sacrifice, and (2) the farmer, if the animals are designed for labor[337].

[337]I think the same balance in ideas recurs a little later in the same passage, namely in G. 3. 174–176 pubi...non gramina tantum nec vescas salicum frondes ulvamque palustrem, sed frumenta manu carpes sata, where I believe the sense is, 'Do not have your calves merely feed on grass, leaves, and sedge <such as they can get for themselves by grazing>, but do you yourself with your own hand <*manu*, which I think is emphatic> gather grain for them to eat'. There is a corresponding combination of prohibition and injunction in the following words, 176–178 nec tibi fetae more patrum nivea implebunt mulctraria vaccae, sed tota in dulcis consument ubera natos—'do not use your milk for other purposes <as you would in the case of less favored calves>, but give it all to them'. This interpretation of the lines assumes a zeugma, for some such verb as *pasces*, in the sense of 'let graze' rather than of 'feed' personally, must be supplied with all the accusatives except the last. The question as to whether there is a zeugma is raised by C. in regard to *gramina*, and it assuredly applies to *frondes* and *ulvam* also. If, as C. suggests, *gramina* means hay or even grass cut green, there may be some sense in bidding the farmer not to content himself with gathering merely this for his calves; but what farmer needs to be told not to gather willow leaves or sedge? All this the grazing calf can get for himself if he wants it; but the farmer would not think of gathering it for him. Surely, then, we are justified in understanding that a contrast is tacitly indicated between the self-activity of the calf, when left to his own devices, and the special activity on the part of the farmer, in the calf's behalf. In the same way Jahn (so C. tells us) explains G. 3.394–395 at cui lactis amor, cytisum lotosque frequentis ipse manu salsasque ferat praesepibus herbas as meaning "that they <the animals> are not to be left to look for salt herbage for themselves" (C., however, suggests an alternative sense). In this passage *ipse* may be compared to *tu* in G. 3.163, and *manu* to *manu* in G. 3. 176.

B. EXAMPLES INVOLVING DIFFERENT CLASSES OF WORDS

1. NOUNS AND NON-NOUNS

a. NOUN AND CLAUSE

(1) Noun and Main Clause

The combination of a noun and an independent clause may amount almost to an anacoluthon.

Thus 1.338–339 Punica *regna vides*, Tyrios et Agenoris *urbem*, sed *fines Libyci*, genus intractabile bello should logically be *Punica regna vides, sed fines Libycos* (or at least *sed fines qui Libyci sunt*). The fusion is probably brought about by the fact that the first clause is virtually equivalent to *Punica regna sunt*[338]. We may say that in the sentence as it stands, *sed* joins the two clauses, *Punica regna vides* and *sed fines* ⟨*sunt*⟩ *Libyci*, but the real balance in thought is between the noun phrase *Punica regna* and the clause *fines* ⟨*sunt*⟩ *Libyci*.

Another example is 9.325–328 Rhamnetem. . . , qui. . .proflabat pectore somnum, rex idem et regi Turno gratissimus *augur*[339], sed non augurio *potuit* depellere pestem. A more logical form would be *qui augur erat, sed* (*qui*[340]) *non potuit*. In Greek the clauses *qui erat* and (*qui*) *non potuit* might well be rendered by participles[341]. Yet undoubtedly the concise form of the Latin gives the strongest possible antithesis.

A close parallel to this is 12.766–771 sacer Fauno. . .oleaster. . .hic steterat, nautis olim venerabile *lignum*. . . ; sed stirpem Teucri nullo discrimine sacrum *sustulerant*[342], which might in like manner be

[338]We may perhaps compare this failure to maintain the same construction through the whole sentence, with that exhibited in the relative clauses cited just above (58–67). Note also 6.860–862 (note 285), and other examples where adjectives are balanced by verbs (129–136).

[339]The use of the nominatives *rex* and *augur* after the accusative *Rhamnetem* is also irregular. It is undoubtedly due to the interposition of the clause introduced by *qui*, which may be said to have attracted the following nouns into the nominative. Compare note 359.

[340]For the doubtful combination *sed qui*, see note 184.

[341]For (*qui*) *non. . .potuit depellere* Latin might perhaps have used the participial adjective phrase *impotens depellendi*; compare *impotentes regendi* in Livy 35.11.10.

[342]There is a passage that I am inclined to regard as rather similar to this, except that a connective corresponding to *sed* is not expressed, though it is distinctly implied by the contrast involved in *olim. . .nunc* (compare the antithetical correlation of *nunc. . .tum, post. . .tum*, in the instances cited on 50). This passage is 12.206–211 sceptrum hoc. . .numquam. . .fundet virgulta nec umbras, cum semel in silvis imo de stirpe recisum matre caret posuitque comas et bracchia ferro, olim *arbos*, nunc artificis manus aere decoro *inclusit*, which certainly belongs here provided that the words *posuitque. . .inclusit* are punctuated in the manner that I have adopted (which is that of Ribbeck and of K.). But there are three other possible methods of pointing, all of which do away with the grammatical parallelism of the noun *arbos* and the clause *nunc . . . inclusit*. The first method is that of H., who has no pause at all before the words *olim arbos*, which thus must be taken very closely with *caret* and *posuit*. This, I think, is not to be desired,

paraphrased *quod venerabile lignum erat, sed cuius*[343] *stirpem Teucri sustulerant.* In the preceding example the full force of the contrast lay not in *augur* alone, but in *Turno gratissimus augur.* Similarly, in this example the clause balances not *lignum* alone, but *venerabile lignum.* It might be even more exact to say that it balances *venerabile* alone; and therefore this example might perhaps be classed with those cited below (129–139) as an instance of the coordination not of noun and clause, but of adjective and clause.

9.702–705 sternit Aphidnum, tum Bitian. . . , non *iaculo*[344]. . . , sed magnum stridens contorta *phalarica venit*[345] represents a fusion of *Bitian* (*sternit*) *non iaculo sed phalarica quae venit* (or *phalarica veniente*) and perhaps *in Bitian non iaculum sed phalarica venit.* On this see further below (99).

(2) Noun and Dependent Clause

(a) Relative Clause

When the clause is one introduced by a relative, the anomaly is less marked. Indeed, we may note in passing that this use of a relative clause coupled by a coordinating conjunction with a preceding noun or adjective[346] is perfectly regular in that most clear and precise of languages, French[347], though it is a mark of slovenly writing in English[348].

---

for the point is not that the shoot was already 'formerly a tree' at the time that it was cut from the parent trunk and stripped of its leaves, but that now, in the form of a scepter, it must be viewed as 'once a tree', 'no longer a tree'. The second method of pointing is that of N., who uses a semicolon after *ferro* and another after *olim arbos*,thus making it possible to supply the verb *erat* with *olim arbos*, and as a result removing from the passage at once its grammatical irregularity and its highly effective compactness. The third method, which I have not seen anywhere in use, consists in placing the clause beginning with *nunc* in parentheses (compare again what was said of the examples on 50). This method is open, I think, to precisely the same objection as N's., namely, that it weakens the contrast.

[343]See note 340.

[344]Compare the two other examples (cited on 98–99) of a noun in the ablative parallel with a clause. But in these instances the incongruity is far less, since the clauses are both *dependent* (compare the last paragraph on this page).

[345]On the parenthetical clause, omitted here, which is also combined with the ablative *iaculo*, see 75.

[346]For examples with adjectives, see 137–139.

[347]For instance in André Maurois's charmingly written and widely admired work, Ariel, I find examples on two successive pages: "Elle avait déjà repris le teint d'une fille *de seize ans*, et *qu'on aime*" (70), relative clause parallel with an adjective phrase; "Une jeune fille *amoureuse*, et *qui se sait* armée d'une telle promesse, ne peut résister longtemps" (71–72), relative clause parallel with an adjective. See André Maurois, Ariel ou La Vie de Shelley (Paris, Bernard Grasset, 1923).

[348]At least to my mind. But it cannot be denied that we find examples of such coupling even in the writings of authors who have a reputation as stylists. Thus I have noted in Samuel Johnson's An Account of the Harleian Library, printed in volume 1 of the Catalogus Bibliothecae Harleianae (London, Thomas Osborne. 1743): "The Admirer of Greek and Roman Literature will meet, in this Collection,

1′. *NOUN A SPECIAL TYPE*

a′. Noun Denoting the Agent

Parallel with a noun indicating the agent we may find a relative clause virtually doing duty for a second such noun, which may be rare or unpoetical or even non-existent, or which can scarcely be combined with the requisite adverbial phrases.

4.483–485 sacerdos, Hesperidum templi *custos*, epulasque draconi *quae dabat* et sacros *servabat* in arbore ramos may be said to represent a fusion of *templi custos epularumque dator*[349] (*draconi* would scarcely fit) et *sacrorum servator*[350] *ramorum* (*in arbore* would scarcely fit), and *quae templum custodiebat epulasque draconi dabat et sacros servabat in arbore ramos*.

On the same order is 9.205–206 est animus lucis *contemptor* et istum *qui* vita bene *credat* emi. . .honorem. There is no existing Latin noun at all to replace *qui credebat*: *creditor*, which Vergil nowhere uses, is restricted to a special meaning. The best we could do would be to say *et credens*: even that would be properly parallel not to *contemptor*, but to *contemnens*[351]. But for *contemptor* we may easily substitute *qui contemnat*.

2′. *CLAUSE A SPECIAL TYPE*

a′. Antecedent of Relative Incorporated in Clause

The relative clause coordinated with a noun may, in accordance with the very common Latin idiom, have incorporated within itself the antecedent of the relative. By simply removing this antecedent to a place outside its clause, we find as parallel for the other substantive a noun in place of the relative clause, and may thus satisfy our English ideas based on a language in which word-order is all-important for sense; but we must remember that to the Roman there existed probably only a negligible difference between a relative clause which followed the antecedent of the relative, and a relative clause in which the antecedent was incorporated. Thus in the first example below, *nec quae saxosas inter decurrunt flumina vallis* might just as easily for a

---

with Editions little *known* to the most inquisitive Critics, and *which have escaped* the Observation of those whose great Employment has been the Collation of Copies" (7). Again, in Robert Louis Stevenson's Prince Otto (The Biographical Edition, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1923), I find the following: 6–7, "'Invitation to the Road;' an air continually *sounding* in the ears of gypsies, and *to whose inspiration our nomadic fathers journeyed* all their days"; 238, "an open tract of the forest, *full* of brush and birches, and *where the starlight guided him*".

[349]The word occurs only once in Vergil (1.734).

[350]This word Vergil does not use at all.

[351]Moreover, such a use of the participle in Latin (equivalent to a Greek participle with the article) is not sanctioned by common classical usage: "generally the Participle expresses a closer connection than the mere explanatory Relative" (G.-L., § 637).

Roman, and more easily for a person biased by the English point of view, have run in less picturesque manner, *nec flumina quae saxosas inter decurrunt vallis*. On the other hand, in E. 3.41–42 descripsit radio totum qui gentibus *orbem*, *tempora quae* messor, *quae* curvus arator *haberet*, it is hard to say whether a Roman felt that *tempora* was used in connection with the main verb *descripsit* as *orbem* is, or with the dependent verb *haberet* (in the latter case it may be that *quae* is interrogative, not relative: then the example belongs below, on page 94).

Examples are E. 5.83–84 nec percussa iuvant fluctu tam *litora*, nec *quae* saxosas inter *decurrunt flumina* vallis[352]; G. 1.184–185 inventusque cavis *bufo* et *quae* plurima terrae *monstra ferunt*; 6.728–729 hominum pecudumque *genus vitae*que volantum et *quae. . . fert monstra. . .*pontus[353]; 7.737–738 tenebat Sarrastis *populos* et *quae rigat aequora* Sarnus[354]; 12.181–182 *Fontis*que *Fluvios*que voco, *quae*que aetheris alti *religio* et *quae* caeruleo *sunt numina* ponto.

b′. Antecedent of Relative not Expressed

1″. ANTECEDENT MAY BE SUPPLIED

11.396–397 haud ita me experti *Bitias* et *Pandarus* ingens et *quos mille* die victor sub Tartara *misi* may perhaps be dealt with in the same way as the previous examples, since *mille* may be said to serve as a quasi-antecedent for *quos*. However, *mille* is not really used in quite the same way as the antecedents in the passages cited in the preceding paragraph. For instance, if we compare 11.396–397 with G. 1.184–185, we see that *mille* corresponds to *plurima* rather than to *monstra*. So perhaps, if we are determined to make the non-parallel parallel, it might be better to supply an antecedent for *quos*, namely, *ei*.

There are several other instances where, to satisfy our instinct, which ordinarily demands an antecedent for a simple relative[355], we are tempted to supply *ei* or some such form; but of course there is no real need for this[356], and a Roman would probably not have dreamed of it[357].

---

[352]A very similar example of this sort of incorporation and coordination occurs in Horace, Carmina 4.3.10–11 *quae* Tibur *aquae* fertile *praefluunt* et spissae nemorum *comae*.

[353]For *genus* and *vitae* as parallels for *monstra*, see 196 and note 866.

[354]For the succeeding lines, see 92. [355]For compound relatives, see 92–93.

[356]Even in English 'who' in an indefinite sense does not really need an antecedent any more than 'whoever' (compare note 355). Compare Shakespeare, Macbeth, 1.7.46–47, "I dare do all that may become a man; Who dares do more, is none."

[357]Just as he did not seem to feel the lack that vexes us when, to balance a relative in any given case, we wish to supply a second relative in a different case. Compare 47–58.

A typical example[358] is 7.710–717

una ingens Amiterna *cohors* priscique *Quirites*,
Ereti *manus* omnis oliviferaeque *Mutuscae*;
qui Nomentum urbem, *qui* Rosea rura Velini,
qui Tetricae horrentis rupes montemque Severum
Caspariamque *colunt* Forulosque et flumen Himellae,
qui Tiberim Fabarimque *bibunt*, *quos* frigida *misit*
Nursia, et Ortinae classes populique Latini,
*quos*que secans infaustum interluit Allia nomen.

A similar passage is 7.725–730 mille rapit populos, *vertunt*. . . Massica *qui* rastris, et *quos*. . .Aurunci *misere* patres Sidicinaque iuxta aequora, *qui*que Cales *linquunt*, amnisque. . .accola Volturni, pariterque *Saticulus* asper Oscorumque *manus*. Here the clauses are *vertunt*. . .*rastris*, *quos*. . .*patres*, *qui*. . .*linquunt*; the nouns are *accola*, *Saticulus*, and *manus*[359]. *Sidicinaque iuxta aequora* is difficult. *Sidicina*. . .*aequora* may be nominative, parallel to *Aurunci*. . .*patres* or (less probably) to *accola*, *Saticulus*, and *manus*; *iuxta* is then an adverb[360]. Or it may be accusative, depending on *iuxta*; the latter is then, of course, a preposition. In the second case the whole expres-

[358]Combinations of nouns and clauses, and of other diversified modes of expression, are particularly common in lengthy enumerations of this sort, such as are found so often in Aeneid 7, where Vergil is describing the "gathering of the clans", and of course occasionally occur elsewhere also. It is as if Vergil sought to secure variety through every device at his command, in order to avoid the danger of monotony inevitably inherent in such catalogues. For variations in lists of peoples and places, see 192; in lists of persons, note 1052; in a list of gods, P. on G. 1.6; in lists of trees, pages 5 and 19. On Vergil's love of variety in general, see K., Introduction, § 181 in K.[1], § 196 in K.[2] On a special exhibition of this love of variety, revealed in Vergil's account of the funeral games, in Aeneid 5, as compared with that of his model Homer, in Iliad 23, see Richard Heinze, Virgils Epische Technik[3], 150 and 151 (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1915).

[359]These nouns ought to be in the accusative, not in the nominative; note *populos* above (725). But the insertion of the relative clause, which might be coordinated with either nominative or accusative substantives, has confused Vergil and involved him in an anacoluthon. In other words, we once more have an example of perfect logic when we take a + b or b + c alone, but of faulty logic when we take a + b + c in combination (compare 78). Precisely the same type of confusion produced *soliti* instead of *solitos* in line 741 just below; and a similar type produced *rex* and *augur* for *regem* and *augurem* in 9.327 (see note 339).

[360]This seems to be Fowler's view, if we judge by his translation (in Virgil's "Gathering of the Clans"):

> ". . . . . men who till with hoe
> The wine-blest Massic region, or sent forth
> From their high hills by the Auruncan sires,
> Or Sidicine low-dwellers hard at hand;
> Comers from Cales, and who dwell beside
> Volturnus' shoaly river, and with these
> The rough Saticulan, and the Oscan band."

It will be noted that Fowler by this rendering leaves doubtful just as Vergil does whether *aequora* is parallel with *patres* (designating those who do the sending) or with the relative clauses and *accola* etc. (meaning those who are sent).

sion stands for *patres iuxta Sidicina aequora* (*habitantes*) parallel to *Aurunci . . . patres*, or else for *ei qui iuxta Sidicina aequora habitant* parallel to *qui . . . Cales linquunt*. On this see again below, 125.

Further examples are 7.737–740 tenebat Sarrastis *populos* et *quae rigat* aequora Sarnus[361], *qui*que Rufras Batulumque *tenent* atque arva Celemnae, et *quos* maliferae *despectant* moenia Abellae; 10.182–184 ter centum adiciunt. . .*qui* Caerete domo, *qui sunt* Minionis in arvis, et *Pyrgi*. . .-que *Graviscae*; and 10.161–162 quaerit *sidera*, opacae noctis *iter*, iam *quae passus* terraque marique[362].

2″. ANTECEDENT CANNOT BE SUPPLIED.

In all the foregoing examples, as has been said (90), it is possible, but not at all necessary, to supply *ei* or some similar form. This is not even possible in instances where we find an indefinite compound relative, which, since it contains its antecedent within itself, neither needs, nor can have[363], any other antecedent expressed.

Examples are 9.209 *Iuppiter* aut *quicumque* oculis haec *aspicit* aequis, and G. 2.391–392 *valles*que. . .*saltus*que. . .et *quocumque* deus circum caput egit. With G. 2.391–392 we may compare G. 4.48–50 neu crede *paludi*, aut *ubi*[364] odor caeni gravis aut *ubi* concava pulsu saxa *sonant* vocisque offensa *resultat* imago, in which *ubi* seems equivalent to *ubicumque*, a form not used by Vergil. It is true that *ubi* here is not quite so sweeping in its application as *quocumque* in the preceding example[365]; yet it is indefinite enough to merit inclusion here. There seems to be no more need to supply *locis* in G. 4.48–50, as C.

---

[361]This line has already been cited in a slightly different connection, 90.

[362]Possibly this clause is interrogative, not relative, and it should accordingly be placed not here, but with the examples cited below (93–97). But most likely we had better follow N. and supply *est*. In the first place, the omission of *sit* would be less regular (however, compare note 366, on G. 1.311–313). And in the second place, Pallas probably does not ask *what* Aeneas has endured, but asks questions *about that which* he has endured, just as he asks them *about* his course.

[363]In English we *may* use an antecedent even here, provided that it *follows* the relative, as in Revelations 22.17, "And *whosoever* will, let *him* take the water of life freely." For the reverse case, the *omission* of the antecedent with the *simple* relative, see note 356.

[364]Compare for the use of the relative adverb here, the passages cited in note 215, second paragraph, and further examples listed in connection with adjectives, 138–139; also the examples with interrogative adverbs cited on 97–98.

[365]It is to be noted that the *quocumque* clause is most sweeping: it really includes *valles* and *saltus*, just as in the preceding example *quicumque* includes *Iuppiter*. Compare the similar statement, in note 61, with respect to 6.532–533 and 2.45–48, in both of which the second member is so broad in its application as to include the first. A more logical but perhaps less effective way of writing would demand that we supply *alia* with *quae . . . fortuna* in 6.533, *alius* with *aliquis . . . error* in 2.48, and *alius* with *quicumque* in 9.209. On this see further below, 224–225. The *quocumque* clause in 4.627 is perhaps differently used: on this see 140.

proposes, than to supply *loca* in G. 2.391–392, which C. does not suggest. Indeed, the expression *locis ubi* seems far from natural as Latin.

(b) Interrogative Clause

1′. *CLAUSE INTRODUCED BY INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN OR ADJECTIVE*

Substantive clauses as parallels for nouns are introduced by interrogative pronouns even more commonly, it seems, than by relative pronouns. Passages showing verbs which have as objects both a noun and a dependent question are numerous, and for the most part so simple that they do not require comment, as may be seen from the following instances: G. 1.311–313 quid *tempestates*...et *sidera* dicam, atque. . .*quae vigilanda* viris?[366]; G. 2.255–256 oculis praediscere *nigram*[367], et *quis* cui[368] *color*; G. 4.118–119 hortos *quae cura* colendi *ornaret* canerem, biferique *rosaria* Paesti[369]; G. 4.283–285 *inventa* magistri pandere, *quo*que *modo*. . .apes *tulerit* cruor; 3.458–460 *populos* venturaque *bella* et *quo* quemque *modo fugias*que *feras*que laborem expediet[370]; 5.737 *genus* omne tuum et *quae dentur moenia* disces; 5.747–748 Iovis *imperium* et cari *praecepta* parentis edocet et *quae* nunc animo *sententia constet*; 6.756–759 Dardaniam prolem *quae* deinde *sequatur gloria*, *qui maneant* Itala de gente *nepotes*, inlustris *animas*[371] nostrumque in nomen ituras, expediam dictis; 6.891–892 Laurentisque docet *populos urbem*que Latini, et *quo* quemque *modo fugiat*que *ferat*que laborem[372]; 12.917–918 nec *quo* se *eripiat*[373], nec *qua vi tendat* in hostem, nec *currus* usquam videt aurigamve *sororem*.

---

[366]It is conceivable that *quae* might be a relative here; but I am following P., who supplies *sint* and translates by "...(why should I tell) what signs are watchfully to be noted...". On the omission of the subjunctive of the auxiliary, compare note 569. However, see note 362 also.

[367]As an adjective, *nigram* may at first thought appear out of place in a section dealing with nouns. However, it stands for *nigram tellurem*; and it is not with the expressed *nigram*, but with the understood *tellurem*, or, better still, with the whole phrase, *nigram tellurem*, that the clause *quis cui color* corresponds. Accordingly, the passage seems to belong here.

[368]As an instance of the type under consideration, the passage is not affected whether we call *cui* an interrogative, as does C., or an indefinite, as does P. (with more justice, I think). We may compare the similar doubt with respect to *quae* in 6.532–533, for which see note 61, second paragraph.

[369]C. suggests that *rosaria* may depend on *ornaret* instead of on *canerem*, that is, it may be parallel with *hortos*; but this seems less likely.

[370]Compare 6.891–892, cited below.

[371]*Inlustres animae*. . .*iturae*, in apposition with *nepotes*, would seem more logical here, as the new object presents no new idea.

[372]Compare 3.458–460, above.

[373]Or are these possibly *relative* purpose clauses? Compare "the Son of man hath not where to lay his head" (Matthew 8.20 = Luke 9.58). With a verb of

In 11.249–250 *nomen patriam*que docemus, *qui* bellum *intulerint, quae causa attraxerit* Arpos, there is no copulative; but this does not alter the fact that once more we find nouns and clauses used as parallels. The copulative is lacking also in E. 3.41–42 descripsit radio totum qui gentibus *orbem, tempora quae* messor, *quae* curvus arator haberet. This has been listed above (90) in the section dealing with relative clauses; but perhaps it belongs here.

Slightly longer, but no more complicated, are the two very similar passages that follow: G. 2.477–482 caelique *vias* et *sidera* monstrent, *defectus* solis varios lunaeque labores, *unde*[374] tremor terris, *qua vi* maria alta *tumescant* obicibus ruptis rursusque in se ipsa *residant*, quid tantum Oceano *properent* se tingere soles hiberni, vel *quae* tardis *mora* noctibus *obstet*; and 1.742–746 canit errantem *lunam* solisque *labores, unde* hominum genus et pecudes, *unde* imber et ignes, *Arcturum* pluviasque *Hyades* geminosque *Triones, quid* tantum Oceano *properent* se tingere soles hiberni, vel *quae* tardis *mora* noctibus *obstet*.

Two passages, though undoubtedly illustrative of the phenomenon here under discussion, are harder to analyze.

One of these is 10.149–152 regi memorat *nomen*que *genus*que *quid*ve petat *quid*ve ipse *ferat*, Mezentius *arma quae* sibi *conciliet*, violentaque *pectora* Turni edocet. The clause *Mezentius. . .conciliet* may depend not on *memorat* but on *edocet*; in that case it is parallel not to the nouns *nomenque genusque* (149) but to the noun *pectora*. H's. punctuation, with commas both before and after the clause in question, is non-committal. N., who places a semicolon before the clause and a comma after it, evidently construes it with *edocet*; and he is probably right, since the two clauses introduced by *quidve* correspond so closely to each other that it is perhaps better to set them apart from the *quae* clause.

The other difficult passage is E. 6.74–81 quid loquar aut *Scyllam* Nisi. . .aut ut mutatos Terei narraverit artus, *quas* illi Philomela *dapes, quae dona pararit, quo cursu* deserta *petiverit* et *quibus. . . volitaverit alis*? According to C., *ut narraverit* is to be supplied with *Scyllam*; in other words, *Scyllam* depends upon *narraverit*, and so, I presume, must *quas. . .alis*. C. does not explain the use of primary tenses after *narraverit* (*pararit, petiverit, volitaverit*), which seems to

---

seeing, however, such a possibility seems extremely remote. Even with *habeo*, we can cite not only an example with the relative, Cicero, Cato Maior 85 haec habui. . .quae dicerem, but also an example with the interrogative, E. 2.2 nec quid speraret habebat (for the difference in meaning between the relative and the interrogative forms of expression, see C.).

[374]For *unde* here and in the following example, compare the examples cited in note 364.

me somewhat odd[375]. In view of this, and of the word order, I am rather inclined to take *Scyllam* as the object of *loquar*, as Jahn does[376].

---

[375]It should be noted that both *narraverit* and its alleged dependents, *pararit*, *petiverit*, and *volitaverit*, are distinctly historical in force. The use of a *primary* subjunctive after an historical perfect like *narraverit* (representing *narravit*) is surely rare (see G.-L., § 511, Remark 4). We should certainly have expected the ordinary shift to secondary sequence after the dependent perfect subjunctive (G.-L., §517, Remark 1). The only possible defense of C's. view that presents itself to me is the influence of the historical present *canit* in line 64, which governs primary sequence, as an historical present may (G.-L., § 509.2.1.a), though the secondary sequence is more regular (G.-L., § 511, Remark 1). Since *canit* is followed by *ut duxerit* (in line 65) etc., it is not wholly unreasonable that *narraverit*, which refers to the same period as does *canit*, may be followed by *pararit* etc. Yet we must not forget that *narraverit* does stand for *narravit*, not for *narrat*; and that even an historical present would be quite out of place here, since Vergil is introducing a new and *subsequent* period in the direct reference to himself (and therefore to his own time) in *loquar* (line 74). The tone is distinctly personal here, unusually so for an Eclogue. Compare the opening lines, especially 2, *nostra*; 3, *canerem*; and above all 6–9, *nunc ego...cano*. We may note that immediately after the sentence in which the main verb is *loquar*, there comes a sentence once more referring to the time of Silenus's story-telling, and that the first verbs in this sentence (*audiit* and *iussit*, line 83) very properly have the tense that indicates their time in relation to *loquar*, namely the perfect, although in the next line (84) we have a shift back to *canit* once more.

[376]Jahn in his 1825 edition gives parallels for the copulation of a noun and a clause, but none for the construction *loquar...Scyllam*. This is attacked by Wagner, who reads quid loquar *ut* Scyllam etc. Perhaps in response to Wagner, Jahn defends the usage in his 1838 edition. It cannot be denied that the association with *loquor* of a personal object of the type of *Scyllam* involves some difficulty. Elsewhere Vergil uses only *neuter* accusatives with this verb. He has *verba* in 8.404, *haec* in 10.907, *quae* in E. 3.72, *omnia* in 6.188, *plura* in 7.599 and 11.461, *pauca* in 4.337, *digna* in 6.662, *audita* in 6.266, *ignota* in 2.91. Perhaps the last example, however, may support ours to some extent. *Haud ignota loquor* means literally, I think, not 'I *say* things not unknown' but 'I *speak of* things not unknown'; and this comes nearer than any of the other instances, where the meaning is always 'say', to *Scyllam loquar*, 'I shall speak of Scylla'. Several comparable examples are quoted from Cicero in Harpers' Dictionary, to wit: Paradoxa Stoicorum 6.50 ne semper Curios et Luscinos loquamur; Pro Milone 63 multi etiam Catilinam atque illa portenta loquebantur; Ad Atticum 9.2.3 (so Harpers'; this is 9.2a.3 in the Oxford Classical Text, edited by Purser) Curtius venit nihil nisi classis loquens et exercitus; Ad Atticum 9.13.8 (Harpers' reference, Fam., is wrong) Dolabella...merum bellum loquitur; Ad Atticum 9.13.1 hic quidem mera scelera loquuntur. All but the last of these examples are grouped by Harpers', under "IB2", as illustrations of the meaning "talk of, speak about, have ever on one's lips". The last is listed, under "IB3", among illustrations of the meaning "they say, it is said, they talk of, the talk is of". However, I cannot see any essential difference between this passage and the one which I have placed immediately before it—which, incidentally, comes from the same letter. We must note that all these instances differ from the Vergil passage in that in each there is an idea of constant or repeated speech; and this perhaps diminishes, or even destroys, their value as parallels. They correspond more or less to the common English phrase *talk business*, or to the French phrase coined by Dumas Père in La Tulipe noire, *parler tulipe*; and perhaps do not go much farther toward justifying *loquar...Scyllam* than these expressions would toward justifying the impossible *talk Scylla* or *parler Scylla*. However, the examples given earlier in Harpers', under the meaning "...talk about, mention, utter, name", include three that seem to justify Jahn's view: Plautus, Menaechmi 321–322 quas tu mulieres, quos tu parasitos loquere?; Horace, Carmina 4.15.1 volentem proelia me loqui; and Livy, 5.54.5 ne singulas loquar urbes. Moreover, there seems no reason why *loquar ... Scyllam* is not as readily to be said as *canit...Gallum*, found just

C. calls this view "objectionable, as involving an awkward confusion between the narrative of Virg. and that of Silenus". Yet is not just such an "awkward confusion" involved in the use of the primary sequence in *pararit*, *petiverit*, and *volitaverit*, as if these verbs depended on *loquar* rather than on *narraverit*? The noun *Scyllam* is then parallel to, instead of dependent on, the indirect question *ut. . . narraverit*[377]; and the three indirect questions *quas. . .alis* are then coordinate either with both *Scyllam* and *ut. . .narraverit*, or, more likely, with *mutatos. . .artus*[378], the object of *narraverit*. Thus in any case the passage affords abundant evidence of Vergil's tendency to coordinate nouns and indirect questions.

1.306–309 exire *locos*que explorare novos, *quas* vento *accesserit oras*, *qui teneant*. . . , quaerere constituit also belongs in this categorv if C. is right in construing both the noun and the clauses with *explorare*. This, however, seems to me doubtful[379].

Another uncertain example is 1.454–456 *quae fortuna sit* urbi artificumque *manus* intra se operumque *laborem* miratur. C. apparently takes *quae* as a relative, not as an interrogative, for he regards the expression as equivalent to *miratur fortunam urbis*, and as meaning 'marvels at the prosperity of the city'. But if we follow him we have a decidedly odd use of the subjunctive, which he

---

above, E. 6.64 (compare *virum. . .cano* of 1.1); and it is to be noted that the phrase is accepted without question by Servius. Finally, if we refuse to accept *Scyllam* as the object of *loquar*, we shall have to take it as the object of *narraverit*—which seems scarcely easier.

[377]The passage then belongs below, 97–98, where examples with interrogative adverbs are listed.

[378]C. gives no reason for his assertion that *mutatos* cannot, as Forbiger believes, stand for *mutatos esse*; but I think he is right, mainly because Vergil is not using the explanatory narrative style, but is skimming along in a rapid résumé—by chapter headings, so to speak—of matter already familiar to his readers. Then we must regard the expression as of the '*ab urbe condita*' type. We may compare 7.41–42 dicam. . .actos. . .reges (see 216) and 2.549 degenerem. . .Neoptolemum narrare (see 219). Really, almost any periphrastic infinitive in which *esse* is omitted may be treated not as an infinitive but as a participle in an '*ab urbe condita*' phrase, the subject of the infinitive becoming the noun modified by the participle. Compare the Greek usage of a participle after a verb expressing sensual perception. For examples from Vergil involving verbs of sensual perception, see 109–112. See also 108–109 and note 420. For an analogous treatment of the ablative absolute, see note 500.

[379]It certainly seems simpler and more natural to follow K. and take only the noun with *explorare*, and the clauses, despite the resulting asyndeton, with *quaerere*, rather than to regard the latter, as C. does, as "a piece of surplusage for the sake of clearness". It is doubtful whether such surplusage makes for clearness; and as for the parallel "surplusage" which C. cites, 2.75, there again K. has a different and more plausible explanation, with which H., as he shows by his punctuation, is evidently in accord. (On the passage see above, 36 and note 149.) Nor is C's. parallel for the double construction with *explorare* by any means undebatable. He cites the "object clause over and above the accusative in 7.150"; but here once more Professor Knapp is not in agreement with him. See the discussion of this passage, 103–104.

does not explain[380]. The subjunctive could hardly, I think, be deliberative. If we interpret the clause as an indirect question, we have a zeugma, since *miratur* means 'wondering at' with the nouns and 'wondering' with the clause; but there is nothing out of the ordinary in that: for the Roman the distinction in sense may not have existed as it does for us. At any rate we can parallel the usage by another example with *miror*, 8.92–93[381]. 1.306–309, discussed in the preceding paragraph, is similar if C's. explanation of it is correct, since in that case *explorare* means 'explore' with the noun, 'find out' with the verb[382]. Still another instance of precisely the same sort is 4.293–294 temptaturum *aditus* et *quae* mollissima fandi *tempora*, *quis* rebus dexter *modus*, where *temptaturum* shifts slightly in meaning, as C. points out. Here, too, so far as the clause *quae. . .tempora* is concerned, I should have been inclined to consider it possible to regard the pronoun as relative[383] rather than interrogative; but of course the presence of *quis*[384] definitely disposes of that hypothesis.

2'. *CLAUSE INTRODUCED BY INTERROGATIVE ADVERB*

The interrogative clause that is parallel with a noun may be introduced by an adverb[385] as well as by a pronoun or an adjective.

Instances of clauses introduced by *unde* have already been noted (94), namely G. 2.477–482 and 1.742–746.

An example of much the same sort with *quando* is G. 1.252–255 hinc *tempestates*. . .praediscere. . .possumus, hinc messisque *diem tempus*que serendi, et *quando*. . .impellere marmor *conveniat*.

An instance with *ut* is G. 2.120–121 quid ⟨referam⟩ *nemora* Aethiopum . . . , velleraque *ut* foliis *depectant* tenuia Seres? Quite like this is E. 6.74–78 quid loquar aut *Scyllam*. . .aut *ut* mutatos Terei *narraverit* artus if the explanation suggested above (95–96) is correct; but this is very far from certain. There is less doubt about G. 3.23–25 iuvat. . . videre *iuvencos*, vel scaena *ut*. . .*discedat*. . .*ut*que. . .*tollant* aulaea

[380]But it cannot be denied that there really seems little occasion here for an indirect question: Aeneas does not need to wonder what the fortune of the city is, since he sees it so plainly, through the evidence of this very *templum* with its obvious opulence. This passage is very different from 1.516–517 speculantur. . . quae fortuna viris, where we have indubitably an indirect question. (On the omission of *sit*, see note 569.)

[381]Quoted below, 111. On the two different types of complement involved here too, see the discussion there.

[382]Compare further 7.149–151, below, 103–104.

[383]We should then have had an example of the same type as those cited above, 89–90. On the possibility of confounding a relative and an interrogative clause, compare note 373.

[384]According to C., the lection *qui* exists, but "seems to have little or no authority".

[385]Compare G. 4.48–50, cited on 92; and see note 364.

Britanni. With this passage we may compare E. 4.50–52 aspice. . . *mundum*, *terras*que *tractus*que maris *caelum*que. . .: aspice venturo laetentur[386] *ut* omnia saeclo!, where Vergil has chosen to repeat his main verb *aspice* instead of uniting its two objects, noun and clause, by a copulative[387].

(c) Purpose Clause

The substantive clauses just given are indirect questions. We find a substantive purpose clause coupled with a noun in 4.431–432 non iam *coniugium*. . .oro, nec pulchro *ut* Latio *careat* regnumque *relinquat*; and probably also in 5.59–60 poscamus *ventos*, atque haec me sacra quotannis urbe *velit* posita templis sibi ferre dicatis, although once more a different manner of analysis is possible (see 31 and note 131).

(3) Miscellaneous Peculiar Examples

A few odder examples of the parallel use of a noun and a clause are grouped together here[388].

(a) Noun in Genitive and Clause

In G. 1.383–384 *pelagi* volucres et *quae*. . .circum. . .*rimantur* prata Caystri, both the genitive and the relative clause are equivalent to adjectives.

(b) Noun in Ablative and Clause[389]

1′. TO EXPRESS TIME

In G. 1.287–288 multa. . .se *nocte* dedere, aut *cum* sole novo terras *inrorat* Eous, both the ablative and the temporal clause are equivalent to adverbs.

2′. TO EXPRESS CAUSE

2.34 sive *dolo* seu iam. . .sic fata *ferebant* is more peculiar than the preceding example, since the clause here has no introductory word corresponding with *cum* there. It is true that *seu* subordinates the clause in a sense, but strict logic would demand a second conjunction[390], so that the clause introduced by *seu* might be a better *pendant*

[386]So H. P. reads *laetantur*. So does C.; but he says that both lections are admissible, and cites MS. authority for both. The syntax is little affected; see C. and P. *ad loc.*, and compare (with C.) Bentley on Horace, Epistulae 1.1.91, in which he reads viden', ut mutat cenacula, and justifies the use of the indicative after *ut* by parallels from Catullus, Vergil, and the pseudo-Vergil of the Culex.

[387]Compare note 46.

[388]This seems the most convenient manner of disposing of them, even though most of them might have been entered in one or other of the categories already treated. Compare note 151.

[389]Compare the examples of parenthetical clauses coordinated with ablatives, given on 75–77. See also note 302.

[390]Such as we have in 11.661–662, cited below (100). On the other hand, we do not feel the need of any conjunction other than *seu* in the clause introduced by

for the ablative introduced by the correlative *sive*. Prose would almost certainly insert *quod*.

3′. *TO EXPRESS MEANS*

9.702–705 sternit Aphidnum, tum Bitian. . . , non *iaculo*. . . , sed magnum stridens contorta phalarica *venit*[391] is a specimen of even greater inconcinnity, since the ablative expresses means and the clause does not, at least not directly. We cannot, as we did in the previous example, make the clause more nearly parallel to the noun by the simple addition of a subordinating conjunction; we should have to recast the sentence completely, replacing the clause by *phalarica quae magnum stridens contorta venit* or the like.

(c) Noun and Clause Both Dependent on a Preposition

1′. *TO EXPRESS TIME*

In G. 2.536–537 *ante* etiam *sceptrum* Dictaei regis et *ante* impia *quam* caesis gens *est epulata* iuvencis, both phrase and clause indicate time[392].

(d) Noun but not Clause Dependent on a Preposition

1′. *TO EXPRESS PLACE*

In G. 3.277–279 diffugiunt, non, Eure, tuos, neque solis *ad ortus*, *in Borean Caurum*que, aut *unde*. . .Auster *nascitur*, both phrases and clause indicate place.

---

this word in a passage which may perhaps be offered as a parallel, 7.234–235 dextramque potentem, sive *fide* seu quis bello *est expertus* et armis. Here it is possible that *fide* is an ablative of specification modifying *potentem*, and that the clause introduced by *seu* is correlative with this ablative, even though it does not itself precisely express specification. Compare 9.702–705, cited just below, in which the clause parallel with an ablative of means does not itself precisely express means. However, I doubt whether 7.234–235 should be classed here. *Dextram. . .potentem. . .fide* does not make very good sense, and so I should hesitate to associate *fide* with *potentem*. I should prefer, as does C., to regard it as modifying *est expertus*, exactly as the phrase *bello. . .et armis* does. In that case this ablative is a part of the clause having *est expertus* as its verb, not parallel with this clause; and there is no serious inconcinnity about the passage, or any other exceptional feature apart from a slight peculiarity of word-order, unless we wish to stress the fact that *fide* is not viewed from quite the same angle as *bello. . .et armis* (for this see 160–161).

[391] Already discussed above, 88 and note 344. See also note 302.

[392] The repetition of *ante* (compare note 66), and the addition to it of *quam* as an introductory word for the clause, perhaps soften the inconcinnity. More striking are two English examples which I have noted. One of these is from The Best Stories of Mary E. Wilkins, edited by Henry Wysham Lanier, 209 (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1927), in the story called Billy and Susy (pages 209–221): ". . .they were considered an example of sisterly affection for the whole village, *until they were both old women* and *the advent of Billy and Susy*." The other example is from The New York Sun, June 8, 1929, page 1, in a report headed Hopeless Health Causes Death Leap: "She received legal permission to reassume her father's name *after her husband joined his country's colors in 1914* and *his subsequent death in action*."

2'. *TO EXPRESS PLACE AND TIME, RESPECTIVELY*

In 11.661–662 seu *circum Hippolyten* seu *cum* se Martia curru Penthesilea *refert*, the phrase indicates place; the clause, time. More logical would have been *seu circum Hippolyten seu (circum) Penthesileam cum se refert*, or *seu cum Hippolyte seu cum Penthesilea se refert*; but the variety secured by Vergil is doubtless more poetical.

3'. *TO EXPRESS SPECIFICATION AND TIME, RESPECTIVELY*

In 11.736–737 at non *in Venerem* segnes nocturnaque *bella*, aut *ubi* curva choros indixit tibia Bacchi, the phrases, indicating specification, and the clause, indicating time, are to be taken as coordinate, if we follow what I believe to be the correct interpretation (for a different view, see below, 113).

b. NOUN AND INFINITIVE

(1) Noun in Nominative

An infinitive is made parallel with a noun as subject of the sentence in G. 4.178–179 grandaevis *oppida* curae et *munire* favos et daedala *fingere* tecta, and 9.775–776 cui *carmina* semper et *citharae* cordi numerosque *intendere* nervis.

10.55–57 quid pestem *evadere* belli iuvit et Argolicos medium *fugisse* per ignis totque. . .exhausta *pericula* almost surely belongs here, since *exhausta pericula* is in all probability a noun expression of the '*ab urbe condita*' type[393]; but of course it is also possible to supply *esse*, in which case the lack of parallelism is no longer in the part of speech but merely in the voice[394].

G. 3.525–526 quid *labor* aut *benefacta* iuvant? quid vomere terras *invertisse* gravis and E. 5.45–46 tale tuum carmen. . .quale *sopor*. . . ,

[393]Compare Horace, Carmina 1.1.3–5 pulverem. . .*collegisse* iuvat *meta*que. . . evitata. I prefer to join *meta* with *iuvat* rather than, as some authorities do, with *evehit*. It is true that those opposed to me may prefer to couple *meta*. . . *evitata* and *palma*. . .*nobilis* as details selected to represent the two most thrilling moments of the race; but to me the sentence appears to flow otherwise. It seems to me that the charioteer *is delighted* (*iuvat*) by his combination of the two factors that go toward the winning of the race, namely, speed (as indicated by *pulverem* . . .*collegisse*) and skill (as indicated by *meta*. . .*evitata*); and that when finally, as a result of the possession of these two qualities, he wins the race, he *is exalted to the gods* by the ennobling palm (*palma*. . .*nobilis*. . .*evehit ad deos*) that is the emblem and symbol of his triumph. To take *evehit ad deos* with *meta*. . .*evitata* (the means) as well as with *palma*. . .*nobilis* (the end) would, to my mind, spoil the force of the climax. The words *meta*. . .*evitata* belong far more with *pulverem*. . . *collegisse* than with *palma*. . .*nobilis* in thought, even though not in form. But as for the form, we need not scruple to attribute to Horace the copulation of a noun and an infinitive in lines 3–4 of a poem that in lines 19–21 presents an indubitable example of such copulation, namely, nec veteris *pocula* Massici nec partem solido *demere* de die spernit.

[394]Compare 19–21. For this particular example, see note 92.

quale. . .sitim *restinguere* correspond to these examples just as does E. 4.50–52 to those under which it is listed (see 98 and note 387).

We may further compare the balance between the noun and the infinitive in G. 3.209–210 non ulla magis viris *industria* firmat quam Venerem. . .*avertere*.

(2) Noun in Genitive

Noun and infinitive serve as objective genitives in 10.501–502 nescia mens hominum *fati sortis*que futurae et *servare* modum.

(3) Noun in Dative

Noun and infinitive may be datives of purpose in 11.180–181 non *vitae* gaudia quaero, . . .sed nato manis *perferre* sub imos. But on this see below, 102–103.

(4) Noun in Accusative with a Verb

Particularly frequent in occurrence is the combination of a noun and an infinitive as direct objects[395].

(a) Infinitive without Subject Accusative

A clear and simple instance is 6.620 discite *iustitiam*...et non *temnere* divos.

G. 1.25–26 urbisne *invisere*...terrarumque velis *curam* almost assuredly belongs here. There can be little doubt that *urbis* is the object of *invisere*, and *invisere* and *curam* are the objects of *velis*. Order and sense alike favor this view. Some, however, consider *urbis* not an accusative plural[396], but a genitive singular, parallel with *terrarum*. Then the object of *invisere* must be *curam*. But *invisere curam* is certainly an odd locution[397], and the other interpretation is much simpler and more natural.

---

[395]Compare this sentence from an unsigned review of Paul Elmer More's With the Wits, in The New York Times Review of Books, December 21, 1919, 774: "The volume deserves careful *study* in academic circles and *to be* widely *read* by the general public."

[396]Of course if we follow H. and P. and read *urbes*, there can be no shadow of doubt; but in view of Probus Valerius's statement (quoted by Aulus Gellius, 13.21.4) that Vergil himself wrote *urbis*, it seems that this lection (which C. adopts) is surely preferable.—Gellius's piquant discussion (13.21) of this question of *-is versus -es* and kindred details is well worth reading.

[397]P. particularly protests against it as "a very redundant phrase"; but the English rendering that he gives, "watch over the care of Rome", is perhaps not quite fairly chosen as an equivalent of the Latin. The verb *invisere* in Vergil does not mean 'watch over'. In the other three passages in which it occurs, 4.144, 8.159, 11.588, it means 'go to see', 'visit', as P. himself points out with respect to the first and the last of these passages. In other words there is always present in this verb a distinct idea of motion. To carry this idea over to the metaphorical sphere, and use the word with *curam*, I think would suggest not the static "watch over the care", but 'go to look after the care', that is, 'undertake the care'.

9.507 quaerunt pars *aditum* et scalis *ascendere* muros involves a sort of zeugma, at least from our point of view, since *quaerunt* with the noun means 'seek for', with the verb 'seek' or 'try'[398]. On the other hand, though C. does not mention it, there is also the possibility that *ascendere*, like *effundere* and *detrudere* just below (509, 510), is an instance of the historical infinitive, which may be combined with the indicative, as in 3.140–142 and 3.666–668[399]. In the latter passage the finite and infinitive forms are joined by *et*, exactly as they are in 9.507 if the view just suggested is the correct one.

11.180–181 non vitae *gaudia* quaero,. . .sed nato manis *perferre* sub imos is much harder. C. couples *gaudia* and *perferre*, the latter with a second *gaudia* to be supplied as its object. The awkwardness involved apparently does not trouble him, although it does in the case of the alternative explanation which he suggests, that of taking *perferre* as a "Greek infinitive", as in Horace, Carmina 1.26.1–3 tristitiam et metus tradam. . .portare ventis. C. objects to this explanation also on the ground that we might have expected not *nato*, but *natum*[400] (as the subject of *perferre*); but it seems to me that the dative (of reference) *nato* here is scarcely less natural than the dative (of indirect object) *ventis* in the example just quoted from Horace, which C. himself cites as a parallel. C. apparently disregards another possibility inherent in this interpretation, namely, to take *nato* not, as he seems to, as dative of reference depending on *quaero* and practically parallel with *vitae*[401], but as dative of indirect object or of goal[402] depending on *perferre*, which is the natural construction for it in the interpretation that C. himself prefers. If we thus refuse to accept C's. explanation, it is Evander, not Pallas[403], that is to perform the action indicated by *perferre*. This word, as C.

---

[398]Compare 1.306–309 and 1.454–456 (96-97).

[399]See 32.

[400]Or *gnatum* as he spells it. I am here, as regularly, following the orthography of H.

[401]This explanation Professor Knapp tells me is the one that he prefers. He paraphrases by "I seek joys not for my own life, but for my son's sake, that I may carry them through, that is, report them". This view seems to me the most satisfactory on the whole. If it is correct, the passage belongs neither here nor above (101), nor, indeed, anywhere in the present study, since there is involved only the coordination of two parallel elements, the two datives, *vitae* and *nato*. To be sure, *vitae* is not a perfect parallel for *nato*; the contrast would be brought out better by *meae vitae*, better still by *mihi* (*vivo*).

[402]Some might class this dative with *perferre* also as one of reference. The name given to the construction does not matter much; the essential thing here is the question as to whether it is on *quaero* or on *perferre* that the dative, in whatever category we choose to place it, depends. On the difficulty involved in an attempt to classify every noun with precision, see note 33.

[403]Indeed C. himself implies this by his paraphrase, "non vitae quaero gaudia sed gnato, quae *perferam illi*" (the italics are mine). In view of this I can hardly

says, seems to refer to the expression *perferre nuntium* (in accordance with Vergil's very common habit of using one phrase to suggest another[404]). The meaning of *perferre* is, then, 'to convey' in the sense of 'to report' (not *simply* 'to convey', as it must be if the agent is Pallas, in which case the force of *per* seems lost). This is more in keeping with what seems to be the Vergilian usage of the word, which everywhere in Vergil seems to have one of three fundamental meanings: 'to report'[405], 'to convey all the way, to a journey's end'[406] (with more emphasis than it would bear here, I think, were that the signification in the present passage), and 'to endure'[407]. Evander then says, 'It is not for my life that I seek this pleasure ⟨so far C.⟩, but to carry (word of) it to my son among the shades below.' Accordingly, *perferre* is an infinitive of purpose, in other words a dative[408], and so is a fair parallel for *vitae*.

In 10.866 iussa aliena *pati* et *dominos* dignabere Teucros, Wagner takes *pati* and *dominos* as the objects of *dignabere*. However, as N. points out, this is not necessary, as *pati* may govern both nouns, *dominos* being coordinate not with it but with *iussa*. In this event we still have a slight irregularity, since the two nouns are not strictly parallel and mutually exclusive (on this see 220).

(b) Infinitive with Subject Accusative

The infinitive which is made parallel with a noun as direct object of a verb very often is accompanied by a subject of its own.

The simplest example that I have noted is 10.758–759 *iram* miserantur inanem amborum et tantos mortalibus *esse labores*.

Not so certain an instance is 7.149–151 *urbem* et *finis* et *litora* gentis diversi explorant[409]; haec fontis *stagna* Numici, hunc *Thybrim fluvium*, hic fortis *habitare Latinos*. C., in his note on 1.307, says,

understand his remark already mentioned, *which immediately follows* this paraphrase, namely, "perhaps in that case we might have expected 'gnatum' to be the subject of 'perferre.'"

[404]See C. on G. 2.364, 1.381, 1.508; and the list of examples given in the Index in K.[1] (579) under the head Suggestiveness of Vergil's Language. Compare also notes 4, 6, 9, and 605. This whole question, a most fascinating one, I hope to treat at some future time.

[405]As in 5.665, 9.692, 11.825. [406]As in 1.389, 10.786, 11.717, 11.803, 12.907.

[407]As in G. 2.343, 3.323, 3.584, 4.420, 5.617, 5.769, 6.437, 8.293, 9.289, 9.426, 10.695, 12.177.

[408]Compare Charles E. Bennett, New Latin Grammar, § 326, note (Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1918): "The Infinitive was originally a Dative, and traces of this are still to be seen in the poetical use of the Infinitive to express *purpose*. . . ." However, it should be noted that only the present *passive* infinitive is derived from the dative, whereas the present active is derived from the locative, as Bennett himself says in the Appendix to his Grammar, § 243 and § 246; compare Stolz-Schmalz[5], 328 (cited in note 39).

[409]Here, as in 9.507 (102 and note 398), there is a zeugma. Compare another example with *exploro*, 1.306–309, already discussed, 96.

" 'Explorare' has an object clause over and above the accusative in 7.150". This is denied by Professor Knapp[410], who tells me that he would supply some verb of reporting to govern *haec...Latinos*: the omission of this verb he explains as an example of Vergil's "indirection"[411]. Grammatically, the omission does not seem to me very natural; but an even more difficult syntactic problem is involved in the view of C., who does not offer any justification of the strange use, quite without parallel in Vergil, of O. O. with *explorare*.

It seems to me that much the same problem is presented by 11.896–900

> interea Turnum in silvis saevissimus implet
> nuntius et iuveni ingentem fert Acca *tumultum*:
> *deletas* Volscorum *acies*, *cecidisse Camillam*,
> *ingruere* infensos *hostis* et Marte secundo
> omnia *corripuisse*, *metum* iam ad moenia *ferri*. 900

Of this passage we may say either, as K. does of 7.149–151, that the indirect statement depends upon some verb of saying understood, or, as C. does of 7.149–151, that the main verb governs the infinitive clauses as well as the noun. C. holds this latter view with respect to the present passage also. He takes *fert* as equivalent to *nuntiat*, and compares 11.141 quae ⟨= Fama⟩ modo victorem Latio Pallanta ferebat. There is, of course, not the slightest doubt that *fero* can be used in the sense of *nuntio*: see e.g. 6.502–504 fama...tulit... te...procubuisse. But whether *fero* with the simple accusative can have this meaning seems to me doubtful. I find no certain example of this use in Vergil. Examples with such words as *iussa* and *responsa* (see e.g. 4.378, 9.369, 11.227) are not parallels: there *fero* has practically its primary meaning of 'bear, bring, carry'. Neither is the example cited by C., 11.141, a true parallel. *Fero* there does *not* govern the simple accusative: the presence of the predicate accusative *victorem* makes the object virtually equivalent to the clause *Pallanta esse victorem*[412]. It might be said that in our passage *ingentem* plays the same part, that the sense is not 'brings word of

[410]He disagrees with C. on the subject of 1.307 also; see note 379.

[411]See his Introduction, K.[1] § 225, K.[2] § 254. In favor of this view one might cite as a parallel 9.230–232 (discussed in note 148, second paragraph); but the latter passage is simpler, since it is easier to supply a verb of saying from *orant* than from *explorant*.

[412]The sense is precisely the same whether or not we supply *esse*. In one case *victorem* is a predicate accusative with *esse*, in the other with *ferebat*. A good parallel is 5.664–665 nuntius...incensas perfert navis Eumelus, where also we are free to supply *esse* or not. If we do, *incensas...navis* is a clause in indirect discourse; if we do not, it is a phrase of the '*ab urbe condita*' type (compare 108–112, 215–217). On the other hand, *esse* must be supplied in 7.436–437 classis invectas Thybridis undam non...meas effugit nuntius auris.

great alarm', but 'brings word that the alarm is great'. This, however, I doubt; the emphasis would appear to be on *tumultum*, not on *ingentem*. I am inclined to wonder whether *fert* may not have its primary meaning of 'bring', whether, in other words, the passage may not mean 'Acca brings great confusion to the youth'. Then *tumultum* refers not to the panic or alarm that Acca is reporting, but to the state of confusion into which she throws Turnus. N. tells us *ad loc.* that 'panic' or 'alarm' is "the genuine meaning of the word", and Servius connects *tumultus* with *timor multus* in his note on 2.486–487 domus . . . gemitu miseroque tumultu miscetur. But the idea of fear is not by any means always predominant in this word as Vergil uses it: for instance it is wholly absent in 3.99–100 mixtoque ingens exorta tumultu laetitia. The root idea is certainly that of wild confusion, such as I would assign to the word in 11.897. Two passages in particular furnish an excellent commentary on the one here under consideration. One of these is 11.447–448 nuntius ingenti per regia tecta tumultu ecce ruit magnisque urbem terroribus implet. The verbal similarities are notable: *nuntius* in the sense of either 'messenger' or 'message', and *implet*, as well as *ingenti . . . tumultu*, which is explained by C. as the "alarm and confusion" spread by the *nuntius*, precisely as I would take *ingentem . . . tumultum* in 11.897. The other passage is 8.4–6 extemplo turbati animi, simul omne tumultu coniurat trepido Latium saevitque iuventus effera. Here *saevit . . . iuventus effera* precisely corresponds to the result wrought by Acca's report on the behavior of our *iuvenis*. We may note *ille furens*, in 11.901; and also, in the same verse, *saeva Iovis sic numina poscunt*, a statement which certainly implies that Turnus is misled, by his own confusion and by an unfriendly providence working behind and through this confusion[413], into a most ill-advised course, the abandonment of his own carefully-laid plan to waylay Aeneas from ambush. This behavior on Turnus's part may well be described by the word *tumultus*. I see no reason why such *tumultus* cannot be said 'to be brought to Turnus' by Acca. As parallels for the construction *iuveni . . . fert Acca tumultum* in the sense of 'Acca brings confusion to the youth', I would offer 10.273–274 Sirius ardor ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus, E. 4.61 matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses, 6.464 hunc tantum tibi me discessu ferre dolorem. If one can say *dolorem alicui ferre*, why not *tumultum alicui ferre*? (In 3.99–100, quoted above, we find *laetitia* treated as a parallel for *tumultus*, so that *dolor*, too, would seem to be a safe parallel.) Finally, there

[413]Compare note 774.

occurs a decidedly similar phrase in our own passage, 11.900 metum iam ad moenia ferri. If my view is correct, the infinitives in 11.897–900 may be said to be used precisely as are those in 7.149–151, according to Professor Knapp, and also those in 7.577–579 Turnus... terrorem ingeminat: Teucros in regna vocari, stirpem admisceri Phrygiam, se limine pelli: they depend not on the main verb, but on some verb of saying understood. Or we may say that they do depend on the main verb, *fert*, but that it is used in the sense of 'report' with them, though not with *tumultum*, in other words that the passage presents an instance of zeugma (compare note 409). According to C's. view, the infinitive clauses are simpler to explain: they may be regarded either as coordinate with *tumultum*, or as in a sort of rather loose apposition with it.

I would place here also as an illustration of the coordination of noun and infinitive the much-debated passage 11.264–272[414]

regna Neoptolemi referam versosque *penatis*
Idomenei? Libycone habitantis litore *Locros*? 265
ipse Mycenaeus magnorum ductor Achivum
coniugis infandae prima inter limina dextra
oppetiit, devictam Asiam subsedit adulter.
invidisse deos, patriis ut[415] redditus aris
coniugium optatum et pulchram Calydona viderem? 270
nunc etiam horribili visu portenta sequuntur
et socii amissi petierunt aethere pennis.

I believe that *invidisse* is parallel with *regna* (*versa*) and *versos*...*penatis* in 264, *Locros* in 265. I would, therefore, place an interrogation

[414]The view given here was presented by me before the American Philological Association, at Princeton, December 27, 1923; and an abstract of my paper appears in the Proceedings of that body, 54 (1923), xviii.

[415]The use of *ut* is rather odd. I can find no parallel for it in Vergil. At first thought, it might seem as if we should rather expect *ne*, a reading which C. tells us actually exists; but that, too, is unexampled in our poet. We find *ne* in 11.42–44 tene...invidit Fortuna mihi, ne regna videres nostra...?; but this is not at all apposite, since the *ne* clause here is adverbial, not substantive. The element in this sentence which corresponds to the *ut* clause in our passage is not the *ne* clause, but the pronoun *te*, which serves as direct object of the verb. Vergil uses *invidere* with the accusative also in E. 7.58 Liber pampineas invidit collibus umbras, G. 1.503–504 nobis caeli te regia, Caesar, invidet, 4.234 Ascanione pater Romanas invidet arces?, 8.508–509 mihi...senectus invidet imperium, and perhaps 9.654–655 primam hanc tibi magnus Apollo concedit laudem et paribus non invidet armis. In view of this usage, Page's explanation of *invidisse*...*ut*...*viderem* as standing for *invidisse hoc, ut viderem*, seems satisfactory. We find as object of *invidere* an infinitive in Horace, Sermones 1.2.100 plurima, quae invideant pure apparere tibi rem, and perhaps a *quod* clause in Lydia 1–3 = Dirae 104–106 invideo vobis, agri, formosaque prata, hoc formosa magis, mea quod formosa puella ex vobis tacite nostrum suspirat amorem (where, however, the *quod* clause may depend upon *hoc*); and there seems to be no reason why an *ut* clause cannot be similarly used. At all events, its use with *invidisse* does not in any way affect the construction of *invidisse* itself, or the point that I am trying to make in my discussion of the whole passage.

point after *viderem* in 270 with H., not an exclamation point with C. C. explains *invidisse deos* as an exclamation—"surely the gods need not have grudged me this." Wagner, however, considers an exclamation here inappropriate, and surely he is right: for Diomedes's mood is purely demonstrative or judicial, not emotional[416]; he is showing the fortunes of his own side, not reproaching the gods. Indeed, how could he have expected favors from the gods, how could he venture to reproach them in regard to his own personal affairs, when he sees how much more wretched still are others? Wagner believes that verses 266–268 (*ipse. . . adulter*) may be a late addition by Vergil, as they constitute a harsh interruption to the thought; and Ribbeck actually transfers 264–265 to a position after 268[417].

[416]C. compares for the "feeling" 4.550 (4.550–551 runs non licuit thalami expertem sine crimine vitam degere more ferae, talis nec tangere curas) and 5.82 (5.82–83 runs non licuit finis Italos fataliaque arva nec tecum Ausonium. . . quaerere Thybrim). But surely he is wrong: these two passages are the expressions of lamentation, of vain regret; the present one is, I am convinced, a mere statement of fact. Since C. views the infinitive here as expressing emotion, he might have done better to cite as parallels for it examples in which not *licuit* but an infinitive of exclamation is used. Such examples are 1.37–38 mene incepto desistere victam nec posse Italia Teucrorum avertere regem! and 1.97–98 mene Iliacis occumbere campis non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra. . . ! (the latter, I think, is a particularly good parallel for the tone that C. finds present in 11.269). In both these passages the presence of *-ne* increases the difficulty of the view that *invidisse*, which is not accompanied by this particle, is an infinitive of exclamation. Compare Page *ad loc.*, and K's. Introduction, § 158 Note in K.[1], § 173 Note in K.[2]. One exclamatory infinitive without *-ne* may be cited from Vergil, to wit 5.615–616 heu tot vada fessis et tantum superesse maris! vox omnibus una. But here, though the editors do not, apparently, so take it, it is just possible that the infinitive is in O. O. For the use of *heu* in an indirect statement, we may compare *eheu* in Horace, Carmina 3.2.9. (Concerning this, see further Professor E. H. Sturtevant in The Classical Weekly 20.24, and the present writer, *ibid.* 22.131.)

[417]According to Ribbeck's transposition, the passage would run as follows:

ipse Mycenaeus magnorum ductor Achivum
coniugis infandae prima inter limina dextra
oppetiit, devictam Asiam subsedit adulter.
regna Neoptolemi referam versosque penatis
Idomenei? Libycone habitantis litore Locros?
invidisse deos, patriis ut redditus aris
coniugium optatum et pulchram Calydona viderem?
nunc etiam horribili visu portenta sequuntur
et socii amissi petierunt aethera pennis.

The flow of these lines as rearranged is to some extent supported by that of an earlier passage, 10.36–41, which is as follows:

quid repetam exustas Erycino in litore classis,
quid tempestatum regem ventosque furentis
Aeolia excitos aut actam nubibus Irim?
nunc etiam manis (haec intemptata manebat
sors rerum) movet et superis immissa repente
Allecto medias Italum bacchata per urbes.

There is some correspondence between *referam* and *quid repetam*, both used with reference to past events which are dealt with in summary fashion, in contrast with the more detailed treatment accorded to present enormities, as marked by

But this seems to me scarcely necessary, although C. says: "To suppose that Virg. could have intended to interrupt the construction after v. 265 and return to it again here is quite out of the question."[418] I am not sure that it *is* "quite out of the question". To me, the march of the thought seems admirable as the passage stands. As C. says, the reference to Agamemnon *himself* should certainly follow those to Neoptolemus, to Idomeneus, and to the Locrians, who are all dismissed briefly. Verses 266–268 are added to elaborate on 264–265, and are practically parenthetical, though not necessarily so punctuated. The idea is: 'Shall I recall the case of Neoptolemus, of Idomeneus, of the Locrians?—But surely this is unnecessary. Why, even Agamemnon himself, the leader of all, was slain!' Then below: 'Shall I recall the gods' *having* (in the past) grudged *me* a safe return?—But surely this is unnecessary. Why, even *now* evil omens still follow me, and my comrades perish miserably!' The nouns *regna*, *penatis*, *Locros* balance *invidisse deos*, just as the clause beginning *ipse Mycenaeus* balances the clause beginning *nunc etiam*. In each case there is a distinctly contrasted pair. In the first the *less important* men, who lost merely their *kingdoms*, are contrasted with the more important man—*ipse Mycenaeus*—, who lost even his *life*. In the second only Diomedes is concerned, since the calamity of his allies is cited merely as being involved with his own. Here of course there is no question of loss of life on his part, since he is the speaker; but his *earlier* catastrophe, the loss of merely his *kingdom*, is now contrasted with his *later* or *present* catastrophe, the loss of even his *comrades and allies*. This perfect balance between the two sets is lost if the two lines 264–265 are not regarded as parallel syntactically to the two lines 269–270.

Another problem—a minor one, however—is likewise involved in this passage. Is *versos* in 264 a true participle? If so, we have as parallels to *invidisse* simply the nouns *regna*[419] and *penatis*, or, if one prefers to put it so, the whole phrase (*versa*) *regna*. . .*versosque penatis*, an expression of the '*ab urbe condita*' type. Or is *esse* to be supplied with *versos*? If so, we have a true infinitive precisely like

---

nunc etiam. But a similarity of this sort does not present a cogent argument; and the anticlimax produced by the position at the very beginning of the reference to the great Agamemnon and his awful fate seems to me distinctly objectionable.

[418]Professor Knapp agrees with C. He tells me that he doubts whether we may expect a return to any construction after so long an interruption. A passage that might be adduced in his support is G. 2.118–135, where a series of questions is terminated by the parenthesis in 125, and not resumed thereafter. See also note 585.

[419]There can be no doubt, I think, that *regna* is in precisely the same construction as *penatis*.

invidisse. Probably Vergil did not consider the matter at all; but if he did, he would most likely say that the first suggestion is the right one. The participle *habitantes* in 265 certainly suggests that *versos* is also a participle. Besides, Diomedes is not recalling *that* the kingdom and the penates were—or have been—overturned; he is recalling the overturned kingdom and penates[420]—a much more vivid and picturesque form of expression.

The question as to whether a given verb form is a participle or an infinitive[421] comes up particularly often in connection with verbs of sensual perception. E.g., in 9.317–319 *corpora fusa* vident, *arrectos* litore *currus*,. . .*viros*, simul *arma iacere*, *vina* simul, is the meaning that they see bodies scattered, or that they see that bodies have been scattered? Probably the former, the pictorial rather than the narrative type of expression[422]. Moreover, the participial expression *corpora fusa* forms a much better parallel to *viros*,. . .*arma iacere*, *vina* logically, though not grammatically, than would the infinitive expression *corpora fusa esse*.

That there is, sometimes at least, no vital difference after all between the adjectival participle (as modifier of a noun) and the substantival infinitive (with a noun as subject) is shown by such a passage as G. 3.464–467 *quam* procul aut molli *succedere* saepius umbrae videris, aut summas *carpentem* ignavius herbas, extremamque *sequi*, aut medio *procumbere* campo pascentem, et serae solam *decedere* nocti, where Vergil combines the two forms[423], both possible in Latin as in English: one sees a sheep *follow* and one sees it *cropping*[424]. It is doubtful whether there is any essential distinction of meaning. Possibly we may conclude that here the infinitive is a trifle more emphatic, since the infinitives, *succedere*, *sequi*, *procumbere*, and *decedere*, all suggest more or less the slowness and weariness of the

[420]Compare note 378, on E. 6.78.

[421]Sometimes, e.g. in 7.421–422 tot incassum *fusos* patiere labores, et tua Dardaniis *transcribi* sceptra colonis?, and in 11.898 *deletas*. . .acies, *cecidisse* Camillam, we can be practically certain that we have two parallel infinitives, though one exhibits only the participial part. To be sure, C. in his note on 8.107 cites 7.421–422 as an example of "the coupling of a part. with an inf."; but I am almost positive that he is wrong in so doing; and we must not fail to observe that in his note *ad loc.* he contradicts himself, by explaining *fusos* as *fusos (esse)*. Sometimes, on the other hand, we can be practically sure that we have a true participle, as in E. 6.78 (see note 378) and 2.507–508 (cited on 215). But a number of examples are decidedly doubtful.

[422]See again note 378.

[423]To be sure, if we remove the comma decisively placed by C. after 465, thus obtaining the very non-committal punctuation of H. and P., we can arrive at an interpretation which does not make *carpentem* parallel with the infinitives. We might take it as parallel with *extremam*, saying that *-que* joins *carpentem* and *extremam*, not *carpentem* and *sequi*. Here again there would not be perfect parallelism, as one word denotes an action, the other a state (compare 172).

[424]Strange to say, neither C. nor P. comments on this decided irregularity.

sick sheep, whereas *carpentem* in itself does not indicate abnormality (the significant words in the phrase *summas. . .herbas* are *summas*[425] and *ignavius*). Metrical considerations may also be at work to some slight extent; three of the infinitives afford convenient dactyls, two of them in the fifth foot. But, as I have already said (4), the cogency of arguments stressing metrical exigencies often seems to me highly dubious.

2.695–697 illam ⟨stellam⟩ summa super *labentem* culmina tecti cernimus Idaea claram se *condere* silva *signantem*que vias may be recognized as an instance of the same sort[426]; but, as Henry and C. believe, it is far more natural to take *signantem* as connected by *-que* with *labentem* rather than with *condere*, although, as C. says, "there is some slight awkwardness. . .in the separation of the two participles". This awkwardness is removed in Klouček's text (followed by K. in his edition), where the two hemistiches *cernimus Idaea* and *signantemque vias* are ingeniously interchanged.

A more positive example is 12.595–597 *venientem* prospicit *hostem*, *incessi muros*, *ignis* ad tecta *volare*, nusquam *acies* contra Rutulas, nulla *agmina* Turni. Here we have the combination of a noun with a modifying participle, two instances of a noun as the subject of an infinitive, and finally two instances of a noun alone with neither participle nor infinitive. Although a participle cannot be supplied with these last two nouns, since a present participle of *sum* is not available, an infinitive, *esse*, might be, but this is not necessary; indeed, the infinitive, though possible enough with *nusquam acies*, would be rather unnatural with *nulla agmina*.

In 9.549–550 *se* Turni media inter milia *vidit*, hinc *acies* atque hinc *acies astare* Latinas, once more a substantive alone, with no infinitive expressed or understood, is made parallel with an infinitive. (2.507–508, cited below, 215, is not dissimilar, since there *vidit. . . medium in penetralibus hostem* stands for *vidit. . .mediis in penetralibus hostem*.)

In 4.47 quam tu *urbem*, soror, hanc cernes, quae *surgere regna*[427], C., at least, would, apparently, not supply an infinitive with *urbem*.

---

[425]" 'Summas'," says C., "marks the listlessness of the feeder, sheep in health being, as Mr. Blackburn observes, very close biters."

[426]If so, a '*hysteron proteron*' is involved, which may be justified on the ground of the pictorial effect produced. Even after the meteor has disappeared, the vivid trail of light left in its wake still seems visible. As Professor Knapp has suggested to me, the phrase is almost equivalent to a result clause, *ut vias signaret*, which would have naturally fallen into the position that it occupies.

[427]Doubtless the position here of the verb, *between* its two objects, makes easier the disparity in construction of these two objects. (Another way of softening an inconcinnity is pointed out in the discussion of 8.635–637, page 112.) Of course,

He paraphrases by "What a change you will see in this your city!" To be sure, the sense would not be altered if we did choose to supply *esse* or *fieri* or *factam esse*: *surgere* is also possible, but less probable, as the city is already there[428], and does not need to 'rise' as the extended realms or kingdoms do.

On the other hand, in 8.107–108 ut celsas videre *rates* atque inter opacum *adlabi* nemus et tacitis *incumbere* remis, it would certainly be impossible to supply *esse* with *rates*[429]. It is the appearance of the ships, not the fact of their existence, that is noteworthy to Evander and his people. The primitive Arcadians were terrified first by simply seeing the ships, second by seeing them approach their own sheltered grove[430], the rowers[431] resting on their oars[432] with every appearance of men about to make a landing.

A very similar example occurs just a little earlier, 8.92–93 miratur...fulgentia longe *scuta* virum fluvio pictasque *innare* carinas. Here *miratur*[433] means practically 'sees with wonder' or 'marvels on seeing'[434]. The cause of the wonder is twofold: the shining shields[435], and the movement of the boats.

Finally, we may note 8.635–637 *Romam* et *raptas*...*Sabinas* ...addiderat, subitoque novum *consurgere* bellum, comparable to

---

no matter what the construction is, the balance in thought is between *quam*... *urbem* and *quae*...*regna*. On this point see further below, note 687.

[428]Note that 1.437 o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt applies to the present, not to the future. This is true also of 1.365–366 nunc ingentia cernes moenia surgentemque novae Karthaginis arcem, which in structure is not wholly unlike 4.47, with the participle *surgentem* corresponding to the infinitive *surgere*: the force of the participle is probably more progressive, but, after a verb like *cerno*, as has just been said (109), there is often no very sharp distinction between a dependent infinitive and a dependent participle. But there is this difference between the two passages, that from the participle with the second noun (*arcem*) in 1.365–366, we may easily supply another (*surgentia*) with the first noun (*moenia*).

[429]It would be much weaker to make *celsas*...*rates* not a separate object of *videre* but the subject of *adlabi*, even if it were possible. Moreover, *atque*...*et* in the sense of *et*...*et* seems not to be Vergilian. C's. statement to this effect is corroborated by the evidence afforded by Merguet.—Of course we must supply a second *rates* as subject of the infinitive.

[430]The same combination of ideas is expressed by two nouns in 5.35–36 miratus ...*adventum* sociasque *rates*.

[431]As C. reminds us, *incumbere* is "said of the ships when really it refers to the rowers".

[432]See the interesting discussion of this passage in W. Warde Fowler, Aeneas at the Site of Rome², 48 (Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 1918).

[433]On the double construction with *miror*, see 96–97, on 1.454–456.

[434]For a very similar use of *miror* in the sense of 'hear with wonder', compare Horace, Carmina 2.13.29–30 *utrumque* sacro digna silentio *mirantur* umbrae *dicere*.

[435]Or the shining of the shields—the '*ab urbe condita*' construction again. If we stress this—in other words, if we treat *fulgentia* as a true participle rather than as a mere adjective—we get another example of the same type as G. 3. 464–467 and 12.595–597 (for which see 109–110 and 110 respectively).

passages introduced by verbs of seeing, inasmuch as the main verb in meaning bears practically a causative relation to such verbs[436]. Here again, as in 12.595–597[437], we have not only a simple noun and an infinitive with a noun subject, but also, parallel to them, the combination of a noun and a participle. However, whether or not we have an example of the '*ab urbe condita*' construction is in this case neither certain nor particularly important. I am inclined to believe that, when Vergil wrote *raptas. . .Sabinas*, he thought of these two words as a simple noun expression parallel to *Romam*[438]. But, by a shift of emphasis from *Sabinas* to *raptas*, *raptas. . .Sabinas* may easily become an '*ab urbe condita*' phrase, or even an infinitive with subject accusative[439]. After all, Vergil can just as easily say *raptas (esse) Sabinas addiderat* as he said above (630–631) *fecerat et. . .procubuisse lupam*. In each instance the state resulting from the action, instead of the actual process, is shown: the wolf is 'after lying down', as the Irish would say[440], and just so the Sabine women are 'after being seized'. Now if *raptas. . .Sabinas* is regarded as first a noun and then an infinitive, it forms an excellent transition from the noun *Romam* to the infinitive *consurgere bellum*[441].

One example yet to be noticed, namely 3.180–181 agnovit *prolem* ambiguam geminosque *parentis*, *se*que. . .*deceptum*, differs from most[442] of those cited in that, if we have the '*ab urbe condita*' construction, it leads not to faulty but to improved parallelism.

(5) Noun in Accusative with a Preposition

A noun depending on a preposition is made coordinate with an infinitive[443] in G. 3.179–181 sin *ad bella* magis studium *turmas*que ferocis, aut Alphea rotis *praelabi* flumina Pisae et Iovis in luco

---

[436]That is, it means here 'he had showed also, he had caused (those viewing the shield) to see also'. Such seems to be the opinion of K., who says that *addiderat* = *fecerat et* (630), and that the latter = *ostenderat*.

[437]See 110. [438]It is not a perfect parallel, to be sure. See 193.

[439]On the close connection between the two, compare note 378.

[440]We may compare the equally picturesque French expression, *elle vient de se coucher*.

[441]Compare what is said below (216) on 7.41–44, where we find a similar ambiguous phrase effecting a similar transition; and likewise see 136 on 12.319–322 and note 196 on 8.563–566. (A case of the same sort in English is recorded in note 528.) For a different method of softening a possible harshness, see note 427. See, too, note 87, for a transition that appeals merely to the eye. For a transition that leads to an anacoluthon, see notes 339 and 359; also compare K's. view of 10.328–330, referred to on 130. For a transition that leads to confusion from the point of view of logic rather than of grammar, see 79–80 on G. 4.251–259, particularly on 254–255. A simpler transition in the realm of thought is found in 11.641 (note 624). [442]But not all: compare what was said of 9.317–319, on 109.

[443]For a prepositional phrase made parallel to a finite verb, see 99–100, where will be found four examples of the sort. In one of these (G. 2.536–537), the clause

currus *agitare* volantis. A more appropriate form than the infinitive in such a case would, it seems to me, be the verbal noun that normally serves as the object of a preposition, that is, the gerund (or its '*ab urbe condita*' substitute, the gerundive). As it is, the infinitive is probably to be regarded as coordinated with the entire prepositional phrase[444], and is most likely to be taken as an infinitive of specification or almost of purpose[445], though had it not been for the presence of *ad bella*, it might have been more natural to call *praelabi* and *agitare* the subject of the sentence[446] and *studium* (*est*) the predicate.

A parallel for the foregoing example is 11.736–738 aut non *in Venerem* segnes nocturnaque *bella*, aut, ubi curva choros indixit tibia Bacchi, *exspectare* dapes et plenae pocula mensae, if this reading (C's.) be the correct one.. The better MS. authority, however, favors *exspectate*[447], which H. adopts, putting a period at the end of 737, not a comma as does C. C. says, "it is difficult to see what sense is to be extracted from the imperative"; Servius regards the imperative as used for the indicative; and yet to me it seems quite simple to accept this form as an imperative and a genuine one (not a substitute for an indicative) used in an ironic command. We may compare the derisive imperatives of 7.425 *i* nunc, ingratis *offer* te, inrise, periclis, and 11.460 *cogite* concilium et pacem *laudate* sedentes. The latter passage is cited by Page as a parallel for *exspectate* if that reading is correct. He, however, prefers the variant *exspectare*.

c. NOUN AND ADJECTIVE

(1) Noun and Adjective in the Same Case

Perhaps 3.365–366 *novum* dictuque *nefas*. . .prodigium canit is an instance of the correlation of an adjective and a noun. Wagner makes *dictuque nefas* parenthetical, to which C. objects because of the presence of *-que*[448]. C. himself, though, as he admits, no parallel can be offered, regards *nefas* as standing logically for *nefandum*, and K.[1] has a similar statement (which, however, K.[2] omits). It would be simpler to explain the passage by saying that it contains an adjective and a noun coordinated by *-que*, the adjective modifying *prodigium* and the noun in apposition with it (so F.-B.); but the word-order is

itself is actually dependent on the preposition; in the others it is not. Compare further below, note 509. [444]Compare 15–18. [445]Compare note 409.

[446]For a discussion of this indefinite type of infinitive, see C. on G. 1.213.

[447]Only "deteriores quidam" have *exspectare*, according to H. On the assumption that *exspectate* is the correct reading, I have already dealt with this passage in quite a different manner above, 100.

[448]But compare the examples cited on pages 67–77, especially those cited in note 293.

against this[449]. Perhaps the best view is that *novum* as well as *nefas* is a noun, though *prodigium* when unmodified by the adjective *novum* presents rather an anticlimax. It is possible also to regard *nefas* as well as *novum* as an adjective, according to K's. Vocabulary; but to me *nefas* seems only a substantive, and this is the only possibility recognized by Harpers' Dictionary.

5.569 *parvus* Atys pueroque *puer* dilectus Iulo is another somewhat doubtful instance. The alliteration would perhaps make for the coupling of *parvus* and *puer*[450], but it is possible to interpret also, 'Atys small and loved[451] by the boy Iulus, himself, too, a boy'[452].

11.768 *sacer* Cybelo Chloreus olimque sacerdos[453] is a more certain example than that cited just above, and one in which the alliteration, as also the similarity in meaning of the two members, is still more marked.

We may note here also 2.21–23 Tenedos, notissima fama insula, *dives* opum Priami dum regna manebant, nunc tantum *sinus* et *statio* male fida carinis, where, though no connective is present, the adjective *dives* is distinctly coordinated with the nouns *sinus* and *statio* (on this see further below, 140, also note 591).

I have no hesitation in listing here 5.752–754 ipsi..., *exigui* numero, sed bello vivida *virtus*. C. seems assuredly wrong in saying that *virtus* "forms rather a bold apposition to 'exigui numero'"; he is using the word 'apposition' in an extraordinary manner. Surely, the word with which *virtus* is in apposition is *ipsi*, and the relation of *virtus* to *exigui* is that of coordination. In thought if not in logic, *bello vivida virtus* is a satisfactory coordinate for the adjective *exigui*, since it is a picturesque and poetical substitute for some such adjectival locution as *bello fortissimi*. The expression probably represents a fusion of *exigui numero sed virtute potentes*[454] and *exiguus numerus, sed vivida virtus* (*est*). As Forbiger and C. have noted, 11.336–342 Drances..., *largus* opum et lingua *melior*, sed frigida bello *dextera*, consiliis *habitus* non futtilis auctor, seditione *potens*...,

---

[449]In 5.569, cited in the following paragraph, it is far easier to recognize the copulation by *-que* of an attributive adjective and an appositional noun, since there the adjective, not the noun, is placed next to the noun modified.

[450]Compare *novum* and *nefas* in the previous example.

[451]Or 'chosen' if we adopt Jahn's reading, *delectus*—which seems less likely, however.

[452]On the emphatic repetition involved in *puero...puer*, compare above, 12, on 3.329, and see note 54. A somewhat similar line is 9.327 rex idem et regi Turno gratissimus augur (cited again in note 712).

[453]Logically as well as grammatically, the balance is not quite perfect. See 162.

[454]Compare 12.827 potens...virtute. Other phrases that might have been suggested are *virtute egregii* and *virtute praestantes*, for which compare 7.257–258 virtute...egregiam and 8.548 praestantis virtute, respectively.

surgit is very similar; but the apposition of *Drances* and *dextera*, part and whole[455], is perhaps even more difficult than that of *ipsi* and *virtus*, concrete and abstract[456]. The latter passage, too, may be resolved as an example of fusion, of *largus opum, et lingua melior, sed frigidus dextera*[457], and *cuius largae sunt opes*[458], *et lingua melior, sed frigida dextera*. Possibly in the first instance it would, from the viewpoint of grammar, be simpler to understand the verb *est* after *sed*[459]; but anything of the sort is out of the question in the second passage, because of the subsequent occurrence of the verb *surgit*[460]; and in any event an explanation is not to be advocated which provides a gain in logic only by entailing a loss in vigor and vividness.

In 2.86–87 illi me *comitem* et consanguinitate *propinquum*... misit, the circumstance that the noun is in predicate relation with *me* and the adjective is not occasions an additional anomaly which warrants us in classing this example with instances of logical inconcinnity, below (164)[461], where it will be discussed at greater length.

We may note, in connection with the coupling of a noun and an adjective, that of a noun and a participle, in 7.181–182 aliique... *reges*, Martiaque...vulnera *passi*[462]; also in 6.448–449, 12.289–291, 7.707, 12.304–306, and possibly 12.529–530, all of which are treated below, inasmuch as their irregularity is even more marked in the

---

[455]On this see 201 and note 899.

[456]Perhaps this is made easier by the fact that when a man is, as we should say in English, 'all valor' or 'all fear', he can readily be spoken of in Latin as *being* the quality that he possesses. See 214, on the subject of the phrase *metum...Iuli* in the sense of *Iulum metuentem*.

[457]The Latinity of *frigidus dextera* seems doubtful. *Debilis dextera* would appear more natural. But the phrase offered above must be viewed as merely theoretical and hypothetical, like those which occasioned the writing of notes 184 and 189.

[458]According to Servius's interpretation, *largus opum = abundans opibus, dives*; but I think C. is right in rejecting this suggestion. The point is that Drances depends upon his money and his oily tongue to gain his ends, never upon physical prowess.

[459]Compare N's. treatment of 10.328–330, discussed below, 130–131. If we adopt this method here, we still have lack of parallelism: now the adjective is coordinated not with a noun but with a clause—a far commoner, and probably more logical, phenomenon, for which see 129–136.

[460]In view of the presence of *surgit*, C's. punctuation is perfectly amazing. The clause between *potens* and *surgit*, 340–341 genus huic materna superbum nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat, which he marks off by a colon before it and a semicolon after it, assuredly must be made parenthetical, as is done by H. Compare note 297, third paragraph, on C's. failure to use parentheses in another passage (9.704) where they seem demanded by the march of the thought. Compare also note 584, on G. 2.203–207.

[461]Compare the following paragraph, and see also note 453 on 11.768.

[462]This corresponds to the foregoing much as 6.660–664, in which the participle *passi* is coordinated with a series of relative clauses, corresponds to the passages in connection with which it is listed. See 137–138 and note 577.

field of logic than in that of grammar (see 174–175 for the first, and 168–169 for the other four).

(2) Noun and Adjective in Different Cases[463]

Much more common and much more natural than the union of an adjective with a noun in the same case is that of an adjective with a noun in an oblique case other than that of the adjective.

(a) Noun in Genitive

Since the genitive is the adjectival case of the noun, we might expect to find many examples of its coordination with an adjective[464]. However, I have noted only two instances of the sort. In both of these, the genitive is possessive or subjective in type.

One is 7.358 super *natae*[465]. . . *Phrygii*sque hymenaeis. As *Phrygiis* stands here for *Phrygis*[466], the construction is quite natural.

The other is G. 3.277 non, Eure, *tuos*, neque *solis* ad ortus. This is simpler still, since the possessive pronominal adjective, not the genitive of the pronoun, is the regular usage.

---

[463]Apparently C. would class here 5.850–851 Aenean credam quid enim fallacibus *auris* et caeli totiens *deceptus* fraude sereni? He appears to take this as a fusion of *Aenean credam quid enim fallacibus auris et fraudi caeli quae totiens decepit me?* and *Aenean credam quid enim falsus auris et totiens deceptus caeli fraude?* But he realizes himself that this is not an ordinary case of faulty coordination or of confusion. That it certainly is not is emphasized by the fact that little sense is made by the second of the two ideal forms supposed to have been fused or confused: *credam* needs a dative to define its meaning. C. himself would have had to realize this if he had worked out these two forms completely, as I have: for he sees that *credam* cannot be separated from the dative *fallacibus auris*. If we could regard *auris* as an ablative, the rest of the sentence would be much simplified: we could view *auris* as an ablative of cause connected by *et* with *deceptus* (compare G. 4.219–221 and 1.8–9, discussed on 122), or, more simply, as an ablative of means connected by *et* with *fraude*. But I agree with C. that this is out of the question. Since I do *not* agree with C. in his other conclusions, there remain for me two possible courses. (1) I may follow Servius, Ribbeck, and H. in reading *caelo*, placing a comma after it and making *sereni* a noun (this seems rather unnatural, and by no means justified by the substantive use of the neuter plural *serena* in G. 1.393; however, see P's. discussion, on G.1.127, of the substantive use of neuter adjectives). Or (2) I may follow Wagner (Q. V. 34.2) and K. in viewing *et* as used in the sense of *et quidem*, as it assuredly is in 2.49 (compare note 295)—probably the best solution of the problem.

[464]Compare the combination of a genitive and an adjectival clause, in G. 1.383–384 (98).

[465]C., however, reads *nata*. This would be more accurate grammatically, but less so logically, and might even be regarded by some as involving a hendiadys. With this reading, the example belongs below, 143.

[466]This genitive form is found in 12.99.

(b) Noun in Ablative

1'. ABLATIVE = ADJECTIVE

a'. Ablative of Quality

Since the ablative of quality, like the genitive[467], is essentially equivalent to an adjective, it is not surprising that we find a number of instances of its combination with an adjective[468].

An example is 4.179–180 sororem. . .pedibus *celerem* et pernicibus *alis*. It is possible, to be sure, that *pernicibus alis* is parallel with *pedibus* (ablative of specification), not with *celerem* (ablative of quality), but in that event *pernicibus* seems decidedly redundant, and we have perhaps a fusion of *pedibus celeribus et pernicibus alis* and *pedibus celerem et* (*pernicem*) *alis*. It matters little, as C. says, in which way we explain the construction; but it seems to me that the balance obtained by the grouping of two pairs each consisting of a noun and an adjective (and incidentally introducing a pleasing variety) is more to be desired than the strict grammatical accuracy

---

[467]Compare above, 116, and see K. on 1.71.

[468]Occasionally we find the adjective and the ablative of quality both modifying the same noun, but not connected by a conjunction, as in 6.298–299 portitor. . . horrendus. . .terribili squalore Charon. This, like the piling up of unconnected adjectives or ablatives (for which see note 718 and note 44, respectively), is extremely rare. Indeed, even this example is not certain, since it might be explained in either one of two different ways. We may say that the ablative modifies the adjective *horrendus*, not the noun *portitor* or *Charon*, although the word-order is against this. Or we may take the adjective modifier *horrendus* primarily with *portitor* and the noun modifier *terribili squalore* primarily with *Charon*. On this distribution of modifiers, compare 119 on 1.693–694, and 236 on 7.419; on the use of an ablative to modify a proper noun, compare note 39. None the less, it seems to me extremely rash to deny the possibility of such a combination with a single noun. Professor Knapp has brought to my attention the fact that this is done by J. D. Duff in his edition of Juvenal (Cambridge, University Press, 1898). (The situation is not altered by the fact that the modifying substantive of which the commentator is speaking is a genitive, not an ablative.) Duff maintains in his note on 3.4–5 gratum litus amoeni secessus—to which he refers back when he comes to the even more striking passage, 13.147–148 veteris. . . grandia templi pocula adorandae robiginis—that the genitive must be classed as a genitive of definition, and "should not be explained as a gen. of quality; for a noun, to which the latter is attached, does not take an adjective". But there, side by side with the adjective, is the genitive! To me, it seems to make scant difference whether we call it a genitive of quality or a genitive of definition. If it would be a genitive of quality in the absence of the adjective *gratum*, why does it cease so to be in the presence of this adjective? Does the very definition of a genitive of quality exclude automatically its conjunction with an adjective modifying the same noun ? If not, what right have we to try to establish a rule of invariable operation, in the face of such obvious exceptions? Is it not better to admit that a rule *has* exceptions, than to beg the question by taking refuge in a new category? On categories in general, see note 33. On rigid adherence to artificial rules, compare O. J. Todd's interesting comment on "foolish consistency", in The Classical Quarterly 19 (1925), 61, at the beginning of his article on The Character of Zeus in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* (pages 61–67).

obtained by the coupling of two nouns in the same construction; and therefore I should incline to the view that *pernicibus alis* is an ablative of quality[469].

Further examples of this indeterminate and ambiguous type are 6.861 *egregium* forma iuvenem et fulgentibus *armis*, 9.743–744 *rudem* nodis et *cortice* crudo. . .hastam, 11.552–553 telum. . .*solidum* nodis et *robore* cocto, 1.639 arte *laboratae* [470] vestes *ostro*que superbo[471], 6.296 *turbidus* hic caeno vastaque *voragine* gurges. In this last instance K. recognizes only an ablative of quality; but *vasta. . .voragine* might be regarded as parallel with *caeno*, almost forming a so-called 'hendiadys'[472], *caeno* denoting the material and *voragine* the type of motion.

In 7.483 cervus erat *forma* praestanti et cornibus *ingens*, it seems to me that only one explanation concerning the ablative *forma praestanti* is possible, namely, that it expresses quality. Servius takes it with the adjective *ingens*; but C., quite rightly, I believe, disagrees. The expression is rather odd (and thus decidedly more picturesque) inasmuch as the converse type, 'forma *praestans* et *cornibus* ingentibus', would have been much more natural. The stag is not really *ingens* by means of his horns[473]. To be sure, Gossrau says that the height of the horns contributes to the height of the stag, but would that not rather demand 'ingentibus cornibus ingens'[474]? *Any* stag is made taller by his horns, even if they are small; but that fact seems scarcely worth commenting on, if the increase is not notably great[475].

In G. 1.433 ⟨luna⟩ *pura* neque obtunsis per caelum *cornibus* ibit, the two modifiers are predicative, rather than attributive. Their closer association with the verb gives them a slight adverbial slant. An adjective that is used in the predicate approaches an adverb; an ablative of quality that is used in the predicate approaches an ablative of manner. This brings us to a new division of the subject.

---

[469]That, however, it is possible to place undue dependence on an argument of this type is proved by the very similar 9.178 iaculo celerem levibusque sagittis, where obviously both the qualified and the unqualified ablatives depend on the adjective.

[470]The fact that *laboratae* is a participle of course does not alter the case. Compare note 462.

[471]See 148.

[472]Compare note 3.

[473]Or even *in respect to* his horns. Yet we do say in English, 'large of eye', 'long of hair', etc.—though phrases like these, in which the adjective indicates size, seem less common than those with more distinctly descriptive adjectives, as 'bright of eye', 'yellow of hair', etc.

[474]Which, of course, attains the *ne plus ultra* of logical analysis, and would be unthinkable even in prose. Compare note 457.

[475]Of course this discussion may be denounced as splitting hairs. I am well aware that the strict rules of logic neither can, nor should, be applied to poetry.

2′. ABLATIVE = ADVERB

Just as the ablative of quality is essentially an adjectival modifier[476], so various other ablatives—e.g. those expressing manner, means, cause, time, place[477]—are essentially adverbial modifiers. Inasmuch as the adjective—especially the predicate adjective, as has just been remarked—is also very often[478] equivalent in logic to an adverb, it may readily be combined with these ablatives, too, as well as with that of quality. However, the parallelism is not quite so complete, since the adjective used as an adjective pure and simple usually itself indicates quality, whereas the adjective approaching an adverb almost always betokens manner, no matter with what kind of ablative it is combined.

a′. Ablative of Accompaniment

In 11.906–907 *rapidi* totoque feruntur *agmine*, the adjective assuredly expresses manner, and the ablative apparently expresses accompaniment.

b′. Ablative of Means

1.693–694 mollis amaracus illum *floribus* et dulci *aspirans* complectitur umbra is very difficult to analyze. K. believes that *et* connects *floribus* and *aspirans*[479], as the words *dulci aspirans . . . umbra*, he says, "help to express the means of *amaracus . . . complectitur*". This, however, is not the only possibility. We may believe that *et* connects the two adjective expressions, *mollis* and *aspirans*: we may say that each of these is modified by an ablative, *mollis* by *floribus* (though this is rather weak, perhaps), and *aspirans* by *dulci . . . umbra*[480]; or we may recognize an instance here of the trajection of *et*, and take the two ablative expressions, *floribus* and *dulci . . . umbra*, with the two verbal expressions, *aspirans* and *complectitur*—it does not appear to make much difference which we assign to which[481]. There is also the possibility of seeing in *et* a connective of the two ablatives

---

[476]Compare 117.

[477]This classification is often, especially with reference to Vergil, difficult to maintain with precision. Thus the ablative of means readily blends on the one hand with that of manner and on the other with that of cause, or it may even involve an idea of place. See the fuller discussion of this subject, above, note 33. (It should be noted that K.[2], Introduction, § 160, distinguishes rather sharply between the ablative of means and the ablative of cause.)

[478]Especially often in Latin as compared with English.

[479]Compare note 470.

[480]However, this grouping of nearly all the modifiers with the subject has a rather topheavy effect; besides, the word-order is against it.

[481]Compare note 468.

floribus and *umbra*[482], although they are not strictly parallel[483]; they would modify either *aspirans*[484] or *complectitur*, and no matter with which one we class them, there would probably be a secondary reference to the other. However, none of these suggestions affords an explanation strictly satisfactory from the point of view of exact logic, and Vergil himself would probably be hard put to give one, did he think it worth while to try. At all events the different details are distinct enough; and perhaps their indefinite union gives us precisely the soft, shadowy, drowsy picture that Vergil wanted[485].

6.640–641 *largior* hic campos aether et *lumine* vestit purpureo is very similar, although there are not so many possible combinations, since there are fewer details. Both C. and K. combine *largior* closely with the verb, C. calling it a predicate, and K., the equivalent of an

---

[482]Professor Knapp recognizes this additional possibility in his discussion of the meaning of the passage in The Classical Weekly 10.209.

[483]Compare 10.190 inter frondes umbramque. Professor George Dwight Kellogg, in an article in The Classical Weekly 11.120, in which he argues for taking *umbra* in the sense of 'odor', suggests that *floribus et dulci. . . umbra* may be a hendiadys for *suave olentibus floribus*. Professor Knapp, in a foot-note appended to Professor Kellogg's article, characterizes the latter's view as "far-fetched". In this characterization I concur.

[484]This is the view of F.-B.

[485]Just so two phrases describing a maze, 5.591 indeprensus et inremeabilis error, and 6.27 labor ille domus et inextricabilis error, are perhaps intentionally vague and complicated in syntax. (In regard to the passage in which 5.591 occurs, see further, page 85, notes 332 and 333; and on 6.27, see C's. note.) Again, uncertainty of syntax may reflect uncertainty of situation in 2.738–740 and 12. 319–322 (on these see note 572). We may compare Professor Knapp's statement, in The Classical Review 21.46, that "emotional exaltation is regularly attended by syntactical dislocation", as a sample of which he offers Horace, Carmina 1.3. 1–8. In Vergil's description of the chariot race, G. 3.108–109, the structure of the sentence gains in vivaciousness and suggestiveness what it loses in strict logic (see 82). In 7.779–780 currum et iuvenem. . . effudere, the use of a single verb to do duty for the two that logic demands perhaps adds to the general idea of hurry and confusion. A similar instance of zeugma occurs in 11.633–635 et gemitus morientum et sanguine in alto armaque corporaque et permixti caede virorum semianimes volvuntur equi, where again the inappropriate omission adds to the general notion of the fusing of a heterogeneous mass in inextricable confusion (see 209). For an effective use of confused word-order to express a confused state of affairs, we may observe 6.448–449 iuvenis quondam, nunc femina, Caeneus, rursus et in veterem fato revoluta figuram (see 174-175, and also C's. note *ad loc.*); 12.583 exoritur trepidos inter discordia civis; and Horace, Sermones 1.5. 72 paene macros arsit dum turdos versat in igni, with the note by Edward P. Morris (in his edition of the Satires, New York, American Book Company, 1909). A possible (though perhaps improbable) interpretation of E. 5.5–6 views the words as interwoven in a manner that may be meant to suggest the picture conveyed by the passage (see note 74). Jerky, broken word-order is effectively used in 3.172–176, 3.615, and 9.813–814 (see 76–77 and note 307). In G. 2.238–241, the harshness of the rhythm may perhaps be intentional as suitable to the mention of the unpropitiousness for cultivation of salt and bitter soil (see note 303). The form seems to me well adapted to the expression of two contrasting ideas in Vergil's description of the Dream Gates, 6.893–896, as in Horace's pictures of pomp *vs.* simplicity, Carmina 1.38 (on both these passages see note 291). Thus we find many examples of the way in which a creative artist adapts syntax, order, and rhythm alike to the service of the idea that he wishes to convey.

adverb[486]; yet I cannot but feel that *largior* belongs much less closely with the verb than with the subject, or at least that it belongs much less closely with the verb than does *lumine . . . purpureo*[487]. Indeed, it would be possible to group with *aether* both *largior* and *lumine . . . purpureo*, the latter as an ablative of quality[488]; but both balance[489] and word-order, as well as the apparent sense, would seem to be against this.

9.402–403 torquens hastile. . .*suspiciens* altam Lunam, et sic *voce* precatur belongs here if, with C., we read *et* before *sic*[490]. This *et* we may then explain, although C. does not, as connecting *suspiciens* and *voce*: Nisus prays gazing up at the moon, *and* aloud. Probably *suspiciens* is very closely connected with the verb[491]; otherwise there would surely have to be a connective between it and *torquens*[492].

In G. 2.428 *vi* propria nituntur opisque haud *indiga* nostrae, *-que*, according to C., "couples the adverbial substantive with the adverbial adjective"[493].

With reference to 11.760–761 *iaculo* et multa *prior* arte Camillam circuit, K. explains that, since *multa prior arte* expresses means and manner, it may be joined by *et* with *iaculo*[494]. He gives a similar explanation in regard to 5.132–133 *auro* ductores . . .effulgent ostroque *decori*[495].

---

[486]On the similarity of the two, see 118 and 119.

[487]I feel the same difficulty, to a less extent, with *floribus* and *aspirans* in the passage quoted just above; also in the combination of adjective and ablative in 5.498 (on which see 124), of appositive and ablative in 11.677–678 (9), of two adjectives in 7.501–502 (note 689), and of adjective and adverb in 5.447–448 (128), as well as in the English example given at the close of note 528. Such a view makes it very hard to account for the connective *et* or *-que*, since the disparity of the members connected is one of function (non-logical coordination) as well as of form (non-grammatical coordination), inasmuch as the member that seems to be more closely connected with the subject is primarily adjectival in force, and the member that seems to be more closely connected with the verb is primarily adverbial.

[488]Compare the examples cited above, 117–118. [489]Compare note 480.

[490]Both K. and H. omit it, however.

[491]That is, it describes the *manner* of his prayer, in a way that *torquens* does not. (Thus the participle becomes almost adverbial, like many adjectives. Compare note 470.) It should be noted that *suspiciens* is coextensive in time with *precatur*, while *torquens*, inasmuch as it refers to a single action, is not: it probably even refers to a slightly earlier period of time, in spite of being present (compare note 560).

[492]Priscian (1034 Putsch = 646 Krehl) actually regards *et* as serving as this connective; but the word-order is all against his view.

[493]It might be possible to supply *sunt* with *indiga*, parallel to *nituntur*; but this is less logical, less lively, and less likely.

[494]However, Gossrau and Peerlkamp believe that *iaculo*, like *arte*, modifies *prior*. C. also considers *iaculo* coordinate with *arte*; but I am not sure whether he groups these ablatives with *prior* or with *circuit*. He does not make his position clear, except that he disagrees with Gossrau and Peerlkamp in their interpretation of *prior*. See further below, 149 and note 618.

[495]But here again (compare note 494) a different explanation is possible, since

c'. Ablative of Cause

We have one passage, perhaps two, in which a participle[496] is made coordinate with an ablative of cause.

G. 4.219–221 his. . .*signis* atque haec exempla *secuti*. . .dixere involves a fusion of *his signis atque his exemplis dixere* and *haec signa atque haec exempla secuti dixere*.

1.8–9 quo *numine* laeso quidve *dolens* regina probably belongs here, whether we look upon *quo numine laeso* as a simple ablative of cause, or as an absolute ablative, in which case it still suggests cause. The use of the interrogatives rather obscures the real point at issue; but if we replace them by demonstratives, and say 'hoc *numine laeso*, hocve (or perhaps hocque[497]) *dolens*', we have a passage wholly akin to the preceding example. This is in keeping with the paraphrase offered by Wagner and C. for *quo numine laeso*, "quam ob laesionem numinis sui". C. is quite right, I think, in rejecting as untenable two other interpretations that have been offered: (1) that the passage involves an anacoluthon; and (2) that *quo* is to be separated from *numine*. It is quite out of the question here to enter into an exhaustive discussion of this vexed passage; for a résumé of the various views expressed thereon the reader is referred to C.[498]. I am surprised that no Bentley has ever suggested the emendation of *laeso* into *laesa*: this slight change would so beautifully simplify the whole passage that the absolute lack of MS. authority, and the typical Vergilianism of the want of balance in the lines as they stand, would scarcely serve as an obstacle to a certain type of mind[499].

d'. Ablative of Attendant Circumstance

In 9.301 quae tibi polliceor *reduci rebus*que *secundis*, I am inclined to class *rebus secundis* as an ablative of attendant circumstance,

---

here too we may take the two ablatives as coordinate modifiers of the adjective. Indeed, *auro* and *ostro* constitute a more natural pair than *iaculo* and *arte*. But perhaps the word-order is rather against this interpretation.

[496]Compare note 470.

[497]Since *-ve* between two questions often lacks true disjunctive force. Compare, e. g., 1.369–370 and K. *ad loc.*

[498]I cannot refrain, however, from venturing a suggestion of my own—which is that *quo numine laeso* may possibly be dependent on *dolens* instead of coordinate with it. The phrase will then mean: 'angered (*dolens*) over what outrage of her godhead, or for what (other) cause?' See note 61 on the similar combination of two questions, the first specific, the second more sweeping, in 10.670 quae me fuga quemve reducit? and in 6.532–533 pelagine venis erroribus actus an monitu divum? an quae te fortuna fatigat. . .? The example here under discussion corresponds to the first of these in the use of two interrogative pronouns, and to the second in the omission of some word meaning 'other' in the less specific member.

[499]I wrote the above on the strength of evidence furnished by Ribbeck, H., and Wetmore. But I find I was precipitate in my judgment. Some emendator

though perhaps, like the ablative in the previous example, it might also be called an ablative absolute[500]—one equivalent to a circumstantial or a conditional clause. We must observe that there is some doubt as to its being an ablative at all. C. seems to think that *rebus* is a dative standing for *tuis rebus*, i.e.,equivalent to the preceding *tibi*[501]. According to this interpretation, *tuis rebus secundis* would probably mean much the same thing as *tibi beato*, and *tibi reduci rebusque secundis* would signify *tibi reduci beatoque*. But I believe that *rebus secundis* is much more likely to be ablative than dative, and to be parallel with *reduci* than with *tibi*. That is, Ascanius hopes to see Euryalus not only back (*reduci*) but safe and sound (*rebus secundis*).

e'. Ablative of Time

Again in G. 3.155–156 armentaque pasces sole *recens* orto aut noctem *ducentibus astris*[502], as in both the preceding examples, it matters little whether we regard the ablative as absolute or not: in either event it expresses time. To be sure it is also possible that the second ablative, like the first, depends on *recens*; but this seems extremely unlikely: the first phrase appears to me to mean *just after* sunrise, the second, *at* nightfall.

f'. Ablative of Place[503]

In G. 1.141–142 alius latum fundo iam verberat amnem, alta *petens pelago*que alius trahit umida lina, Wagner couples the participle and the ablative of place, and Munro[504] rebukes C. for not accepting

---

must have been at work after all; for Merguet lists *laesa* for this verse, though he does not indicate where he got it.

[500]An ablative of attendant circumstance is next door to an ablative absolute, and might easily be so classed. *Vice versa*, practically any ablative absolute may be treated as an '*ab urbe condita*' type of ablative, not used absolutely (compare note 378); and, though some ablative absolutes (e. g., the preceding and the following examples, respectively) will be found to express cause, time, etc., certainly the majority can most readily be classed as ablatives of attendant circumstance.

[501]He says nothing *ad loc.*; but on 9.278 he suggests that *meis. . .rebus* may stand for *mihi*, and compares the later passage. His note, however, is far from clear: he takes this *mihi* as representing the agent—an explanation which can apply neither to *meis. . .rebus* in 9.278 nor to *rebus. . .secundis* in 9.301.

[502]Compare 4.697 (cited on 125), where an adjective is made parallel to another adverbial expression of time, in this instance a phrase with *ante* instead of an ablative.

[503]Compare with these examples 7.726–728 (page 125), which corresponds to them as 4.697 (125) does to G. 3.156 (123 and note 502).

[504]On page 271 of his review of C's. first volume (cited in note 281). His explanation of *alta petens pelagoque* as equivalent to *alta petens pelagi* (I suppose in accordance with some notion of hendiadys) seems to me decidedly open to question. It may be noted that Wagner, whose listing of this example in Q. V. 34.2 Munro notes with approval, says nothing like that.

this view. The meaning then is, to quote P's. paraphrase, " 'seeking the deep and at sea. . .' ". P., however, calls this expression unnatural, and it is certainly tautological. On the whole it is probably better to put the comma after instead of before *alta petens*, and to take these words (as do C., P., and H.) with what precedes, not with what follows.

In 5.327–328 fere *spatio* extremo *fessi*que sub ipsam finem adventabant, I believe, with K.², that *-que* joins *spatio extremo* and *fessi*. It might be possible to connect not *fessi*, but *sub ipsam finem*, with *spatio extremo*[505]; but this likewise fails to produce parallelism[506], and the word-order would seem to be against it. Besides, in all probability *sub ipsam finem* is to be more closely connected with the verb than is *extremo spatio*. Finally, the latter is well balanced by *fessi*, which likewise, as Gossrau has pointed out, implies that the order was not likely to be changed.

5.498 *extremus galea*que ima subsedit Acestes is a clear example. C. calls 10.734 *obvius adverso*que occurrit[507] an almost exact parallel, and points out that in each passage the nominative adjective is less closely connected with the verb than is the oblique case—a difficulty which I have already felt and mentioned (page 121 and note 487) in connection with 1.693–694 and 6.640–641.

(c) Noun in Ablative with a Preposition

1'. PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE EXPRESSING PLACE

It is possible to regard 8.609–610 natumque *in valle reducta* ut procul[508] et gelido *secretum* flumine vidit as a perfect parallel for the foregoing examples, except for the insignificant detail that the ablative here happens to be introduced by a preposition[509]. We may say that *secretum* with *flumine* practically balances *reducta* with *valle*, and that

---

[505]Then *spatio extremo* would probably be a dative of goal rather than an ablative of place. But the presence of *fere* seems to militate against this possibility. It is more natural to talk about *being almost at* the last lap than about *coming almost to* the last lap.

[506]Compare 17–18, on E. 5.5–6 and E. 8.101–102.

[507]See 12–13.

[508]Perhaps it is the adverb *procul*, and not the prepositional phrase, that the conjunction connects with the adjective *secretum*. Then the passage belongs not here, but below on 129, where it will be found listed again.

[509]Compare, for the coupling of a prepositional phrase with a noun without a preposition, 15–18; with a clause, 99–100; with an infinitive, 112–113; with an adverb, 126–127.

secretum flumine[510] is equivalent to *ad secretum flumen*[511], a construction that, had it not been for the presence of another adjective[512], *gelido*, with *flumine*, Vergil might actually have employed, though probably the transferred epithet produces a more picturesque effect.

(d) Noun in Accusative with a Preposition

In addition to the foregoing solitary, and doubtful[513], instance of the copulation with an adjective of an ablative depending on a preposition, we may note three examples, also not quite certain, of the similar use of an accusative depending on a preposition.

1'. PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE EXPRESSING PLACE[514]

We must place here 7.726–728 quos. . .*Aurunci* misere patres *Sidicina*que *iuxta aequora*, provided that we wish to accept C's. first explanation and interpret *Sidicina. . .iuxta aequora* as parallel to *Aurunci. . .patres* in the sense of *patres Sidicina iuxta aequora* (*habitantes*). In objection to this it may be argued that an adverbial phrase of this type cannot well modify a noun (*patres*) as an adjective (*Aurunci*) does[515]. C. answers this objection by his insertion of *habitantes*, which seems a good deal to supply. But then his second explanation, that the phrase is parallel to *quos. . .Aurunci misere patres* and *qui. . .Cales linquunt*, in the sense of *qui Sidicina iuxta aequora habitant*, involves precisely the same difficulty[516].

2'. PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE EXPRESSING TIME[517]

In 4.697 ⟨peribat⟩ misera *ante diem* subitoque *accensa* furore, we find coordinated a temporal phrase and a participle[518] expressing cause. It is true that *accensa* may correspond to the adjective *misera* instead, but such correspondence, though superior grammatically, is inferior logically.

We may compare 4.620 cadat *ante diem* mediaque *inhumatus* harena, if, with C., we coordinate *inhumatus* with *ante diem*[519].

---

[510]On the question of whether *flumine* can be equivalent to *ad flumen*, see note 534.

[511]For this we may compare 3.389 secreti ad fluminis undam, cited by C.

[512]Compare note 718.

[513]Compare note 508.

[514]Compare G. 1.141–142, 5.327–328, 5.498—all cited on 123–124.

[515]Compare on 11.569, note 45.

[516]For a general discussion of the whole passage, see 91–92.

[517]Compare G. 3.156, on 123.

[518]Compare note 470.

[519]Of course, as C. himself sees, this involves a '*hysteron proteron*'. Perhaps it is simpler to explain this passage as an instance of zeugma, and understand *iaceat* with *inhumatus*.

d. NOUN AND ADVERB

(1) Noun in Ablative

Naturally, the oblique cases of nouns used in an adverbial sense[520] may be made parallel not only to adjectives which approach adverbs in their use, but to true adverbs. However, I find only two examples of such parallelism.

(a) Ablative of Means

In 5.157–158 *una* ambae *iunctis*que feruntur *frontibus*, K. regards *-que* as joining *una* and *iunctis. . .frontibus*. There is just a possibility, however, that *una* is to be taken very closely with *ambae*[521], and that it is the latter word instead, or the group *una ambae*, that is parallel to *iunctis. . .frontibus*. In that case we have an additional instance of the coupling of a noun in the ablative with an adjective, not one of the coupling of such a noun with an adverb.

(b) Ablative of Cause, or of Attendant Circumstance

In 10.739–740 non *me. . .inulto. . .*nec *longum* laetabere, since the ablative expresses cause, or attendant circumstance[522], while the adverb expresses time, the parallelism is perhaps imperfect logically as well as grammatically[523]. Yet N. scarcely seems right in seeing "no real distinction between the two clauses[524] separated by the disjunctive", for two ideas are certainly present: (1) 'I shall not be unavenged'; (2) 'my avenging will take place *soon*'.

(2) Noun in Ablative with a Preposition

In addition to the two examples just noted, in which simple ablatives are involved, we may observe two instances of the coupling with an adverb of the ablative depending on a preposition[525].

---

[520]Compare 119. Quite different is the combination of a substantive and an adverb in E. 3.72 *quotiens* et *quae* nobis Galatea locuta est! (discussed above, 15, in a different connection). Here the pronoun *quae* is used not at all in an adverbial sense, but in a true substantive sense; and it becomes parallel to the adverb *quotiens* only through a shift in the verb. Compare notes 62 and 63.

[521]The combination *una ambae* seems quite as natural as *una omnes* (5.830), *una omnis Scyria pubes* (2.477), *una undique* (3.634).

[522]Or perhaps is used absolutely to denote one of these relationships. Compare 122–123 on 1.8–9, 9.301, and G. 3.156; also note 500. For the uncertainty as to the exact type, compare notes 33 and 477.

[523]Compare the similar discrepancy in 4.697 (125). For a different type of logical inconcinnity, see note 487; and for still another, see page 115.

[524]The word *clauses* is N's. *Expressions* would be a more accurate term.

[525]Compare 124–125 for the similar coupling of an adjective with a noun depending on a preposition. Observe further note 509.

(a) To Express Manner

7.357 *mollius* et solito matrum *de more* locuta est belongs here.

(b) To Express Place

In G. 3.237–239 fluctus uti medio coepit cum albescere ponto, *longius ex alto*que sinum trahit, utque volutus. . .immane sonat, C. makes *longius* and *ex alto* parallel, explaining the construction to be *uti fluctus, cum coepit albescere, trahit.* To be sure, here, as in so many Vergilian similes[526], the syntax is rather vague and ambiguous. We might conceivably explain the sentence as running *uti fluctus (fertur) cum coepit albescere medio ponto longius, ex altoque sinum trahit,* in which case *-que* would join not *longius* and *ex alto* but the two verbs *coepit* and *trahit.* But the word order on the whole would appear to be against this, as also the fact that *utque volutus. . .sonat* seems to be parallel with *trahit,* i.e., *uti trahit.* So says C., rightly, I think; and his view is shared by P.

(3) Noun in Accusative with a Preposition

(a) To Express Place

We also find one passage in which an accusative depending on a preposition is made parallel with an adverb, namely, G. 3.212–213 tauros *procul* atque *in* sola relegant *pascua.*

2. ADJECTIVES AND NON-ADJECTIVES[527]

a. ADJECTIVE AND ADVERB

As parallels to adverbs we find not only nouns which are used in an adverbial sense, but also adjectives that are similarly employed, since the adjective, as was noted above (118, 119), very often approaches the adverb in use[528].

[526]Compare e. g. G. 1.199–203 (43–44, and especially note 181, close of the first paragraph).

[527]For combinations of adjective and noun, see the section just completed, 113–125.

[528]Compare "...the ivy never sere That grows so *green* and *lustily*" (from The Ivy Leaf, by Helen Gray Cone), where *green* is a predicate adjective, *lustily* an adverb of manner. Very similar is this from Men, Women and Ants, by Dorothea Lawrance Mann, in New York Herald Tribune Books, March 7, 1926, 5, "...she need not have loved so *young* and so *impetuously*". In the same periodical, April 15, 1928, 6, in a review entitled A Beauty of Reflective Pain, by Edgar Johnson, we find this interesting sentence: "Finally, unsolicited, the young man comes upstairs, and partly *uncomprehending,* partly *in jest,* but *kindly,* says a few comforting and affectionate words." Here we have a combination of three members, the first and second joined by 'connective repetition' (compare note 46), the second and third by a conjunction. The first member,

5.447–448 ipse *gravis graviter*que. . .concidit is perhaps the most difficult example of this type of correlation that I have encountered. K. says, "*gravis* and *graviter* may be coupled by *-que*, since *gravis* is really adverbial in sense." But it would seem that the use together of an adjective in the sense of an adverb, and of the adverb derived from that adjective, were mere tautology. It appears to me rather that *gravis* belongs very closely with the subject, and *graviter* with the verb[529]; as C. says, "We may strengthen the false distinction if we like by connecting 'ipse' closely with 'gravis,'[530] discriminating the heaviness of the man more sharply from the heaviness of his fall". In other words, the adjective expresses a permanent, the adverb a transient, character; so that even apart from their diverse grammatical forms they are not true parallels logically[531].

Other combinations of adjective and adverb are much simpler and more logical, such as 11.673 *praecipites pariter*que ruunt; perhaps 8.444–445 ocius incubuere *omnes pariter*que laborem sortiti[532]; 8.414–415 haud *secus* Ignipotens nec tempore *segnior* illo. . .surgit, which we may say represents a fusion of *nec dissimilis nec segnior* and *nec secus nec segnius*[533]; and G. 2.290 *altior* ac *penitus* terrae defigitur arbos,where *altior* is practically equivalent to *altius*, a variant which, C. tells us, was actually the adopted reading before Heinsius.

It may be that 10.813–814 exsultat demens; *saevae* iamque *altius* irae. . .surgunt also belongs here. That *-que* connects *saevae* and *altius* is apparently the view of N., who places a semicolon before *saevae*.

---

uncomprehending, is an adjective, a participial adjective of the type of the Latin *inhumatus* or *improvisus* (compare note 695). The third member, *kindly*, though it might be considered an adjective, is, I think, almost surely an adverb. Between the adjective and the adverb there seems to me a greater discrepancy than exists in the other two English sentences just quoted: in those other two sentences, the adjective is used in the predicate, and so approaches the adverb in meaning (compare 119); but in the one under discussion at present, the adjective seems more closely associated with the subject, the adverb with the verb (compare just below on 5.447–448). The gap between the two is bridged to some extent by the second member, *in jest*, which affords a sort of transition (compare note 441), since a prepositional phrase may readily be coordinated either with an adjective (compare 124–125) or with an adverb (compare 126–127).

[529]Compare 121 on 6.640–641, and note 487; also note 528.

[530]With this "false distinction" we may perhaps compare the true distinction, also intensified by *ipse*, in E. 5.44 formosi pecoris custos, formosior ipse, and the imitation thereof, immanis pecoris custos, immanior ipse, which Victor Hugo uses as a chapter heading (Book 4, Chapter 3) in Notre Dame de Paris; likewise in 7.707 agmen agens Clausus magnique ipse agminis instar. Compare also note 701.

[531]See below, 161–171, especially note 700.

[532]See note 732. The example still belongs here if Wagner (Q. V. 34.2) is right in his interpretation, which connects *ocius* and the participle *sortiti*. On the participle, compare note 470. It is possible, however, that *sortiti* is not used as a participle at all, but represents a finite verb, *sortiti sunt*, coordinate with *incubuere*, as is suggested below (173); but this Wagner considers weaker.

[533]Most of the expressions given here may be treated in the same way.

Professor Knapp, however, who uses a comma instead, tells me that he considers the joining of *altius* and *saevae* intolerably harsh, and that he takes *-que* as equal to *itaque* (see his Introduction, §199 in K.[1], §219 in K.[2]). Doubtless we are to infer from the fact that H., too, uses a comma, that he would concur in the view that *iamque* is trajected, and *saevae* and *altius* are not connected.

In 8.609–610 natumque in valle reducta ut *procul* et gelido *secretum* flumine vidit, *et* joins *procul* and *secretum*, according to K. One might regard *et* as connecting *in valle reducta* and *gelido. . . flumine*[534], or *in valle reducta* and *secretum*, but either of these views would also give imperfect parallelism[535]. The difficulty—if difficulty it be in view of so many similar cases—is avoided altogether by various editors, from Servius down to Ribbeck and H., who read not *et gelido* but *egelido* or (so Ribbeck) *ecgelido*.

b. ADJECTIVE AND CLAUSE

(1) Adjective and Main Clause[536]

Adjectives may be correlated with main clauses[537] in precisely the same way as are nouns[538].

---

[534]Provided that *gelido . . . flumine* = *ad gelidum flumen*—which, however, is doubtful. K.[2] treats the ablative as instrumental, not local; and C. appears to hold the same view, if we may judge by his paraphrase, "in the retirement of the river". A possible parallel for *flumine* in the sense of *ad flumen* is offered by *fluminibus* in G. 2.110–111 fluminibus salices crassisque paludibus alni nascuntur, which, according to N. (in the fifth edition), means 'by the rivers'. But the view of C., set aside by the reviser Haverfield in favor of N's. note, is certainly more picturesque and poetical, and probably truer to the Latin: the willows appear to grow in the river. (See note 90 for a criticism of Haverfield's method of revision.)

[535]Compare for the first 5.220–221, 5.448–449, 6.416, 9.269–270, 10.31–32 (15–17); and for the second see 124–125.

[536]Compare the examples of parenthetical clauses coordinated with adjectives given on 75.

[537]An English example is found in Rudyard Kipling's Puck of Pook's Hill, 173 (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909): "A boy not much *older* than myself, but *I could see he was an Officer*, reined up before me and asked what I wanted." Here perfect parallelism would demand the substitution of two relative clauses for the coordinated adjective and main clause (compare the treatment of the not dissimilar passage 6.860–862, suggested in note 285). The sentence would then run, 'A boy *who was* not much *older* than myself, but *who* I could see *was an Officer*, reined up. . . .' Kipling in substituting "but I could see he was an Officer" for the more logical but rather clumsy 'but who I could see was an Officer' is doing what the Greek or the Roman did who replaced a relative by a demonstrative (compare 41, and, for English examples, note 169). Perhaps he did not like the combination of an adversative conjunction and a relative any more than a Roman did (compare note 184). We may say that the form he actually used was produced by the fusion of this suggested sentence containing relative clauses and another possibility, namely, 'A boy not much *older* than myself, but *an Officer*, as I could see. . .'. This form was impossible if the writer wished to avoid the rather stiff subordination of the clause *I could see*.—For another English example, of an odder sort, see note 551.

[538]See 87–88.

In 10.327–330 miserande iaceres, ni fratrum stipata cohors foret obvia, Phorci progenies, *septem* numero, septenaque tela *coniciunt*, it seems to me most natural to explain the verb *coniciunt* as substituted for the participle *conicientes*, coordinated with the adjective *septem*[539]. This is the explanation preferred by Wagner. K. takes *-que . . . coniciunt* as parallel to the preceding *foret*, explaining that "the descriptive appositives *Phorci . . . numero* made it easy for Vergil to slip from the cond. form of 327–328 into narrative. The indic. is more picturesque than *coniceret* would be." In other words, the phrase *Phorci progenies, septem numero* forms a sort of transition (compare note 441); or, to put it differently, we have a fusion of *ni fratrum stipata cohors foret obvia, Phorci progenies, septem numero, septenaque tela coniceret*, and *ni fratrum stipata cohors foret obvia, Phorci progenies, septem numero; septena tela coniciunt*. But this view seems to me open to three objections. (1) It places *septem numero* in the clause that has as its verb *foret*, while *septena . . . tela*, of course, remains in the clause that has as its verb *coniciunt* (representing an original *coniceret*). These two clauses are connected by *-que*, appended to *septena*. Therefore inevitably a break comes after *numero*; in other words, *septem numero* and *septena . . . tela* are separated by the pause that intervenes between coordinate clauses. It seems to me that this break, tending as it does to associate *septem numero* more closely with that which precedes, *foret obvia*, and *septena . . . tela* with that which follows, *coniciunt*, weakens the balance between *septem* and *septena*, a type of balance of which Vergil is fond (compare note 539). (2) This view incorporates into the *ni* clause an idea that does not belong there. The thing that saves Cydon is the arrival of the group of seven brothers, *not* their hurling of seven weapons; some of these weapons accomplish nothing, as we are told at once (330–332). In my opinion, *coniciunt* is not a logical part of the protasis of the condition. (3) The coordination of *foret* and *coniciunt*, even if the latter stands for *coniceret*, seems to me most unnatural, involving as it does the essential disparity in mood and tense, as well as the less important discrepancy in number. N. views this construction as "of quite unexampled harshness", and for this reason prefers to understand *sunt*[540] with *septem*, regarding this clause as independent and placing a colon before it[541]. But does not this

[539]The true balance in thought is not between *septem* and *coniciunt* but between *septem* and *septena . . . tela*. Compare the verbal repetition in 5.447–448 (128), and 10.842 = 12.640 (165): on this point see further notes 54 and 700.

[540]Compare what was said on 114–115 about 5.752–754 and 11.336–339.

[541]N. endorses Heyne's punctuation, which Wagner altered in conformance with the view that I have been advocating. However, Wagner makes the alternative

interrupt the thought unnecessarily? I have already said (note 539) that the *logical* balance is between *septem* (*numero*) and *septena . . . tela* (*coniciunt*); but I think N. goes too far in assuming that the grammatical balance lies there likewise. It seems to me simpler to recognize a thoroughly Vergilian fusion here between the independent construction adduced by N., *septem sunt numero, septenaque tela coniciunt; partim . . . resultant*, etc., and an expression grammatically and logically satisfactory but less natural and forceful, *ni fratrum stipata cohors foret obvia . . . septem numero, septenaque tela conicientes* (*or conicientium*)[542].

Precisely the same problem confronts us in G. 4.273–275 ⟨flos⟩ tollit. . .silvam, *aureus* ipse, sed in foliis. . .violae *sublucet* purpura nigrae[543]. We might place a semicolon before *aureus*, instead of a comma with C. and P. (H. goes them one better, and uses no punctuation at all), and understand *est*[544]. But the non-grammatical parallel is surely more Vergilian. There can be even less doubt in this instance than in the preceding one; for there, as has been said[545], the true balance is not between *septem* and *coniciunt*, but between *septem* and *septena . . . tela*, whereas here the antithesis really exists between the adjective *aureus* and the clause *sublucet purpura*[546].

---

suggestion that it is possible to retain Heyne's punctuation, and explain *-que* as connecting *septem numero* and *septena . . . tela*. This possibility C. disputes, and I think he is right in so doing, even though he does not seem to state the case accurately in saying that Vergil "does not employ the copulative to connect a noun which faintly qualifies the verb with an acc. of the ordinary objective sort, expressing that on which its action takes effect". There is no noun here which "faintly qualifies the verb": *septem*, the word that Wagner suggests may be coupled with *septena . . . tela*, is an adjective qualifying the subject of the verb. This correction, however, is offered only in the interest of accuracy: the fact that *septem* is an adjective modifying the subject of *coniciunt*, not a noun modifying *coniciunt*, does not make it any easier to join this word with *septena . . . tela*.

[542]With the second of these two hypothetical passages, the following finite verbs *resultant* and *deflexit* would be quite impossible: the ideas which they convey would have to be presented through the medium of an ablative absolute. Compare 62–67.

[543]With this and the following examples we may compare the corresponding instances with nouns, 1.338–339, 9.325–328, 9.702–705, 12.766–771, cited above, 87–88. See especially note 338.

[544]Compare N's. treatment of the preceding passage. [545]Note 539.

[546]To be sure, in order to balance the preceding adjective we might here, as there, pick out a certain word in the clause—in this case *purpura*; but the verb *sublucet*, indeed the whole predicate *violae sublucet . . . nigrae*, intensifies and reinforces the idea of color conveyed by the subject *purpura* (for the purple sheen that gleams beneath dark violet—to paraphrase P's. translation—produces a slightly different color effect from that of purple alone), and does not introduce an additional and alien idea, as does the verb *coniciunt*.

It is to be remarked that I am regarding *violae . . . nigrae* as in the dative. The point that has just been made will not be materially affected if, as is possible, these words are in the genitive. In the latter case, *violae . . . nigrae* must be combined with *purpura* instead of with *sublucet* (which would, I think, be less picturesque). For the meaning of the passage if that view is correct, Haverfield

8.671–672 ibat imago, *aurea*, sed fluctu *spumabant* caerula cano is a perfect parallel. Here again we have first a single adjective of color (*aurea*), followed, and balanced, by a combination of verb and adjective (*spumabant. . .cano*) that unite to form a contrasting effect[547].

Very similar is 5.429–432 pugnamque lacessunt, ille pedum melior motu fretusque iuventa, hic membris et mole *valens*, sed tarda trementi genua *labant*. Here to supply *est* before *sed*, for the purpose of obtaining a parallel for *labant*, would seem distinctly peculiar, since the combination *est valens* for *valet* is not Latin. However, if we insert *est* in 430 rather than in 431, the strangeness is much less noticeable; and that is apparently what C. does, for he has a period after *lacessunt* in 429.

We may compare with the foregoing 5.152–154 quem. . .Cloanthus consequitur, *melior* remis, sed pondere pinus tarda *tenet*. To be sure, it is possible also to take *tenet* as coordinate with *consequitur*[548]. In the sense of 'follow vigorously'—the first given by K. in his Vocabulary—*consequitur* may be said to be in adversative relation with *tenet*. However, it seems to me better to balance *tenet* (the disadvantage) against *melior* (the advantage)[549]. We may then say that there is a fusion of *qui melior est sed quem*[550]. . .*tenet* and *melior remis sed peior propter pondus*, or, more naturally though less pointedly, *sed pondere detentus*. In this instance *est* alone cannot be inserted, because of the use of the relative with the verb *consequitur*.

In 5.185–187 Sergestus. . .propinquat, nec tota tamen ille prior praeeunte carina, parte *prior*, partem rostro *premit* aemula Pristis[551],

---

suggests "purple, as of a dark violet, shines faintly (against the gold of the centre)". Thomas R. Price's interpretation is "the purple of the black violet tones down its color". This explanation is given on page 20 of an article entitled The Color-System of Vergil (The American Journal of Philology 4.1–20).

It will be noted that both Haverfield and Price take *purpura* here as meaning 'purple' rather than 'crimson'. We may compare Professor Nelson G. McCrea's statement (page 192 of his paper, Ovid's Use of Colour and of Colour-Terms, in Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler, 180–194, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1894) that red usually, but not invariably, predominates in the mixture of red and blue termed *purpureus*.

[547]An effect which is heightened by the introduction of still a third color in *caerula*; just as in the preceding example also, a third color, though one affording a less striking contrast, is called up by the use of *violae*. Compare K. on 1.592–593: "Latin poets. . .revel in suggestions of color, particularly in contrasts."

[548]In this case we have an example of a non-relative following a relative clause. Compare the passages cited on 62–67, and for this particular instance see 63.

[549]Compare the example immediately preceding, 5.429–432.

[550]See note 184.

[551]The balance *parte. . .partem* (or *parte. . .partim* if we follow the lection—less good, I think—of Ribbeck and H.) replaces the adversative conjunction. Here, as in the use of different cases of the same pronoun referred to in note 166, we have a sort of variant repetition instead of the ordinary type of 'connective repetition', illustrated in note 46. Another example of this special type is 11.124 o fama *ingens*, *ingentior* armis. On this see note 623. Comparable to the corre-

it is no more necessary than in the other passages to supply *est*, though it is particularly easy to do so, as a result of any one of three factors: (1) the use of the coordinating conjunction *nec*[552]; (2) the less close[553] connection of the adjective (the first *prior*) with what precedes; (3) the employment of the second *prior* (which is the true parallel for *melior* of the preceding example).

4.175–176 mobilitate viget virisque adquirit eundo, *parva* metu primo, mox sese *attollit* in auras[554] resembles the preceding example in that it is particularly easy to supply *est* with the adjective. C. appears to do so, to judge from his punctuation, semicolons both before and after *parva metu primo*. Compare note 565 on 5.185–187. Here as there I should rather be inclined to use commas in both places; such is the pointing of H. Yet K's. punctuation, a semicolon before the phrase in question and a comma after it, is better still, for the adjective is certainly more closely connected with the following verb than with the preceding ones; and for this reason the fact that the adjective (*parva*) and the verb (*sese attollit*) really balance each other is here less marked than usual. This is partially due to the omission of a connective between them; but the place of an adversative conjunction is filled by the antithesis of *primo* and *mox*[555], as it is in the preceding example by that of *partem* and *parte*[556].

Two other examples of much the same sort are 6.302–304 ipse ratem subigit. . . , iam *senior*, sed cruda deo viridisque senectus, and 10.200–201 dedit tibi, Mantua, nomen, Mantua, *dives* avis, sed non genus omnibus unum. In both these examples the copula verb must of course be supplied in the second member, that is, with *cruda . . . viridisque* and with *unum*; but it would lead to practically inconceivable choppiness to supply *est* with *senior* or with *dives* (*avis*). The

---

lation of *parte . . . partem* is that of *alios . . . alios* in G. 1.420–422 (cited below, 139–140), which is discussed in note 591. Quite like this, and somewhat like *parte . . . partem*, is the combination *one . . . one* in an English passage which provides a good parallel for 5.185–187 in its collocation of an adjective and a verb. This is a sentence by Mary E. Wilkins, found on page 237 of A New England Nun and Other Stories (New York, Harper and Brothers, no date), in the story called A Gentle Ghost (234–252): "The women looked at each other with pale, shocked faces; one *nervous*; one *shivered*." Here we might supply *was* with *one nervous*, just as, in the Latin lines with which this sentence is being compared, we might supply *est* with *parte prior*; but here as there, such a procedure would rob the passage of its close-knit effectiveness. Incidentally, the reader cannot fail to notice that, effective though it is, the English passage gives an impression of oddness, which is, I think, not produced by the Latin.

[552]But on this see below, 135–136.

[553]Less close, but still close enough: with *ille prior* compare *ille . . . iactatus* in 1.3, and the additional examples cited by C. in his comment thereon, also the discussion of this passage and that of 5.333–334, below, 135–136.

[554]See also above, 82. [555]Compare note 324. [556]Compare note 551.

logical contrast is quite sufficient even if there is no true grammatical parallelism.

6.860–862 ire videbat *egregium* forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis[557], sed frons laeta parum et deiecto lumina vultu is of just the same type, except that here it is not merely undesirable but absolutely impossible to supply *est* with the first adjective, inasmuch as this is accusative, not nominative, and so is linked as closely with what goes before as if it were part of a subordinate clause[558]. For this reason this particular example has already been dealt with in the section devoted to the analogous usage after relative clauses, and a full discussion of it may be seen there (note 285).

The same difficulty arises in relation to 9.344-346 Fadumque Herbesumque subit Rhoetumque Abarimque ignaros, Rhoetum *vigilantem* et cuncta *videntem*[559], sed. . .se. . *.tegebat*[560]. Here either *Rhoetum vigilantem et videntem sed se tegentem* or *Rhoetum qui vigilabat et videbat sed se tegebat* would be precise. Vergil's actual words are perhaps a fusion of the two.

In E. 1.27 libertas, quae *sera* tamen *respexit* inertem, it is not *est* that may be supplied but another *respexit*. The principle remains the same, however; the relation which is indicated by the adversative *tamen* is that of the adjective and the verb[561].

---

[557]On the construction of *fulgentibus armis*, see 118.

[558]Compare on 5.152–154, page 132.

[559]Compare note 470.

[560]Apropos of the troublesome repetition of *Rhoetum*, used once with *ignaros*, once with the exact opposite of *ignaros*, *vigilantem et cuncta videntem*, which C. seems to be at a loss to explain satisfactorily, may not the meaning be as follows?—Rhoetus saw the danger and the slaughter of the others, and took precautions (*vigilantem et cuncta videntem*) by concealing himself; but once behind his huge *crater*, he was of course unseeing as well as unseen; and so, trusting to his refuge, he was finally taken unawares (*ignaros*) after all by Euryalus, who we must suppose suddenly discovered him and pounced upon him without his realizing it. Thus is brought out a contrast between *vigilantem et cuncta videntem* (Rhoetus's first state) and *se tegebat* (his second) that justifies *sed*,which is otherwise hard to account for. To be sure, the tense of *vigilantem et videntem* is no longer correct, since, once behind the *crater*, he, too, is *ignarus*; but the use of a present participle for a past is far from unexampled in Vergil. Compare e.g. G. 4.513, 1.305, 8.47; also note 491, on 9.402.

[561]I have noted a rather similar passage in English where there is a corresponding balance in thought between verb and adverb. This is a sentence occurring in Arnold Bennett's Elsie and the Child and Other Stories, 71 (New York, George H. Doran Co., 1924): "She talked, rather *stiffly*, but she *talked*—and not *unkindly*." Obviously, the conjunction *but* cannot be said to join the two verbs *talked* and *talked*! It might, it is true, be said to join the combination of verb and modifier *talked, rather stiffly* with the unmodified verb *talked*, just as in 5.320 proximus huic, longo sed proximus intervallo, the conjunction *sed* joins the unmodified adjective *proximus* with the combination of adjective and modifier *longo . . . proximus intervallo*. However, the true contrast, so far as the thought goes, inasmuch as the mere fact of her talking is noteworthy, lies between the adverb *stiffly* and the second verb *talked*. This verb is again joined in the same way by the conjunction *and* to the second adverb, (*not*) *unkindly*. With this adverb

5.333–334 *concidit* ⟨Nisus⟩. . . , non tamen Euryali, non ille *oblitus* amorum seems quite similar, except that the adjective, or, to be precise, the participle[562], happens to come after instead of before the verb. It would be particularly easy for us to supply *est* here, and so to make the participle *oblitus* into a finite verb; and indeed the editors before Ribbeck did so, as they showed by placing a period before *non tamen*, and H. reverted to their practice. But C., though it was not without some misgivings that he decided to follow Ribbeck, seems to me to make out a very good case for regarding *oblitus* as a participle. The passage becomes more close-knit and more pointed; and 1.3, the parallel cited by C., furnishes quite conclusive evidence as to Vergilian usage[563].

5.185–186 Sergestus *capit* ante locum scopuloque *propinquat*, nec tota tamen ille *prior* praeeunte carina is, I think, precisely parallel to the preceding example, apart from the fact that the conjunction *nec* is inserted in addition to *tamen*. Here again (with *prior*[564]) we might understand *est*; but surely that would weaken the effect[565]. Of course

---

we might supply still a third *talked*; but, once more, logic demands something different. In E. 1.27, we might supply the verb *respexit* (though this is not so necessary with the adversative adverb *tamen* as it would be with the adversative conjunction *sed*), and thus make the line run *libertas quae respexit, sera, tamen respexit.* This would then be an almost perfect parallel for the first part of the English sentence, "She talked, rather stiffly, but she talked" (there is nothing in the Latin to correspond to the final phrase in the English, "and not unkindly"). The corresponding pairs are the supplied *respexit* and the first *talked*, *sera* and *stiffly*, *tamen* and *but*, the expressed *respexit* and the second *talked*. And *tamen* in thought joins *sera* and the expressed *respexit*, just as *but* in thought joins the adverb *stiffly* and the second *talked*. The correspondence of the adjective *sera* to the adverb *stiffly* is clear enough, for *sera* is almost adverbial in force, like many another Latin adjective: see 119, and compare for an English parallel the almost adverbial use of the adjective *young* in the second of the three examples cited in note 528.

[562]Compare note 470.

[563]Even here, according to C., *est* was once supplied; but I believe no modern editor follows this view. The famous opening lines would lose tremendously if not knit into a single sentence, working up to a grand climax. If any one still hesitates to accept this use of the semi-pleonastic *ille* with a participle, let him note 5.457 nunc dextra ingeminans ictus, nunc ille sinistra (cited by C.), 9.795–796 nec tendere contra, ille quidem hoc cupiens, potis est, 10.384–385 quem non superoccupat Hisbo, ille quidem hoc sperans, in all of which, since we have a present participle instead of a past, there can be no question of supplying *est* (compare what was said above, 132, of 5.429–431); or 6.592–594 pater. . .telum contorsit, non ille faces nec fumea taedis lumina, where, if anything is to be supplied, it is, after the analogy of the three preceding examples, the present participle *contorquens*, suggested by the verb *contorsit* (just as another verbal form is suggested by *respexit* in E. 1.27, cited just above); or 7.803–806 Camilla agmen agens. . ., bellatrix, non illa colo calathisve Minervae femineas adsueta manus, where we have a sure instance of a *past* participle which cannot be regarded as a finite verb, since it is parallel with the adjective *bellatrix*.

[564]Compare point 2 on 5.185–187, page 133.

[565]I would not supply *est* with either *prior* (compare 133). That is why I use commas before both *parte* and *partem*, though H. has a semicolon in the first place, K. in the second, and C. in both.

ille does not need a new verb[566] any more here with the adjective *prior*[567] than above with the participle *oblitus*.

Finally, we must note an odd case, 12.319–322 adlapsa sagitta est, incertum qua *pulsa*[568] manu, quo turbine *adacta*, quis tantam. . . laudem. . .*attulerit*. Here the insertion of a part of *esse*[569] would be particularly simple: we have but to regard *pulsa* and *adacta* as representing finite verbs, coordinate with *attulerit*[570]. But the truth of the matter, here as elsewhere, is probably that we have a sort of fusion: I believe that *pulsa* and *adacta* are felt as true participles with *sagitta*; and that yet (since, owing to the common omission[571] of the auxiliary, they might readily be regarded as finite verbs) they form a transition that leads imperceptibly to the verb *attulerit*[572].

(2) Adjective and Dependent Clause

Since relative clauses are frequently adjectival in force, they may be made parallel to adjectives much more naturally than may independent clauses[573].

---

[566]Compare note 553 and note 563.

[567]For an instance with an adjective, compare 9.478–480 agmina. . .prima petit, non illa virum, non illa pericli telorumque memor.

[568]Compare note 470.

[569]The particular form to be supplied would of course be *sit*. The omission of the subjunctive, though rare, is not unexampled, especially where, as here, the presence of another subjunctive gives an unmistakable clue as to the form to be supplied. Compare K's. note on 1.517. Examples similar to 1.517 are G. 2.479 and 1.743 (both cited on 94). More pertinent to the present discussion, since in them as in 12.320 the form of *sum* to be supplied serves as an auxiliary, are 7. 641–644 (where again we find another subjunctive—three subjunctives, in fact) cantusque movete, qui bello *exciti* reges, quae quemque secutae *complerint* campos acies, quibus. . .*floruerit* terra. . .viris, quibus *arserit* armis, and 6.136 accipe quae peragenda prius; probably also G. 1.311–313 (see 93 and note 366), and possibly 10.161–162 (see 92 and note 362). It will be observed that in the first of these four instances, I am assuming that *exciti*, i. e. *exciti sint*, is coordinate with *complerint*. There is a possibility that *qui. . .exciti reges* is parallel instead with *quae. . .secutae. . .acies*; but *complerint campos* is not a natural predicate for *reges* as it is for *acies*.

[570]This would involve the placing of a period or a semicolon before *incertum*, instead of the comma used by H. and N.

[571]Less common in the subjunctive, to be sure. Compare note 569.

[572]Compare 77–78 on the derivation from two members, a + b and b + c—which are both quite unobjectionable when they exist independently—of a faulty a + b + c. On other ambiguous phrases perhaps effecting a transition, see 112 (on 8.635–637) and notes 196 and 441. Perhaps *incertum* helps to effect the transition here, since it can easily introduce either a participle or a finite verb; compare the odd confusion which its use produces in 2.738–740, as is made clear by K's. note, especially in K.^{2}. Possibly the uncertainty of the syntax in these two passages, especially in the second, is designed to reflect the uncertainty of the situation. For other adaptations of form to thought on Vergil's part, see note 485.

[573]Compare 88.

(a) Clause Introduced by Relative Pronoun

The relative clause coordinated with an adjective is in the majority of instances introduced by a pronoun.

In E. 10.2–3 *pauca. . .* , sed *quae legat* ipsa Lycoris, carmina sunt dicenda, *quae legat* is practically equivalent to *digna quae legat*, or simply *legenda*.

In G. 1.434 et *ille* dies et *qui nascentur* ab illo, we may supply *ei*, but that seems quite unnecessary[574].

G. 2.203–204 *nigra* fere et. . .*pinguis*. . .terra et *cui* putre solum and G. 2.238 *salsa*. . .tellus et *quae perhibetur* amara are somewhat similar to each other. In the second, there exists also the possibility that *et* connects the two adjectives, *salsa* and *amara*; but this appears to be only remote, for such a statement on Vergil's part as this interpretation would involve would have much less point.

Further examples are 5.62–63 adhibete penatis et *patrios* epulis et *quos colit*. . .Acestes; 10.435–436 *egregii* forma, sed *quis* fortuna *negarat*. . .reditus; 7.257–258 progeniem. . .futuram *egregiam* et. . . *quae*. . .*occupet* orbem. In the last passage, Heyne prefers to omit *et*, but surely it is not out of place, since two distinct ideas are involved, that of excellence as expressed by the adjective, and that of dominion as expressed by the clause.

In 12.225–226 *cui* genus. . .ingens clarumque. . .nomen *erat*. . . , et ipse *acerrimus* armis, we are perhaps to supply *erat* with *acerrimus*. N. apparently does so, since he compares with this passage, as "the strongest instance of this kind of looseness of constr. in Virg.", 9.593. The latter passage has already been referred to (49); and the present one should be classed there with it[575] if the verb is to be inserted. However, I doubt whether such insertion is necessary, as the sentence seems stronger without it[576].

In G. 3.56–59 nec mihi displiceat maculis *insignis* et albo, aut iuga *detrectans* interdumque *aspera* cornu et faciem tauro *propior*, *quae*que . . .*verrit* vestigia cauda, we find a participle as well as three adjectives made parallel with a clause introduced by a relative pronoun. A participle[577] is coordinated with a series of relative clauses in 6.660–

---

[574]Just as it seems unnecessary to supply *hanc* in Horace, Carmina 1.11.4–5 seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam <hiemem> quae nunc. . .debilitat. . .mare. Compare 90.

[575]Or possibly with the instances mentioned on 41–47, since we may say that to the demonstratives therein corresponds the intensive. See note 168.

[576]With *et ipse acerrimus* compare *nec. . .ille prior* (5.186), and what was said thereon, 133 and note 553, 135–136 and note 567.

[577]For the use of the participle in general, see note 470. For a reference to this particular passage, see note 462.

664 hic manus ob patriam pugnando vulnera *passi, qui*que sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat, *qui*que pii vates et Phoebo digna locuti[578], inventas aut *qui* vitam *excoluere* per artis, *qui*que sui memores alios fecere merendo.

(b) Clause Introduced by Relative Adjective

A participle is made parallel with a clause introduced by a relative adjective in 2.589–592 se. . .obtulit et. . .refulsit. . . , *confessa* deam *qualis*que videri caelicolis et *quanta solet*. This passage perhaps represents a fusion of *confessa deam, talisque qualis. . .solet, tantaque quanta. . .solet* and *confessa deam qualis et quanta. . .solet*. Possibly *-que* is correlative with *et*[579] in 592 instead of being connective[580]; but no editor appears so to regard it, and indeed the other explanation seems easier.

(c) Clause Introduced by Relative Adverb

The relative clause may be introduced by an adverb[581]. An example is 5.28–31 sit mihi *gratior* ulla ⟨tellus⟩, *quove* magis fessas *optem* demittere navis, quam quae Dardanium tellus mihi servat Acesten et patris Anchisae gremio complectitur ossa?[582]

Probably we may list here also G. 2.203–207 *nigra* fere et. . . *pinguis*. . .terra et cui putre solum. . .optima frumentis; non ullo ex aequore cernes plura domum tardis decedere plaustra iuvencis; aut *unde* iratus silvam *devexit* arator. The *unde* clause is probably

---

[578]On this line, see below, 166–167.

[579]For examples of Vergil's use of *-que. . .et* as correlative, see 2.5–6 quae*que* ipse miserrima vidi *et* quorum pars magna fui and 10.767 ingreditur*que* solo *et* caput inter nubila condit. These seem to contradict Madvig's statement that *-que. . .et* connect single words, not propositions. See I. N. Madvig, Lateinische Sprachlehre für Schulen², 435, Anm. 1 (Braunschweig, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1847).

[580]Compare the similar doubt expressed above, 34, on 12.176–181, and below, note 1073, on 3.90–92 and the other passages there cited.

[581]Compare G. 4.48–50 (92 and note 364).

[582]It is possible that *quo* here is not a relative at all, but an interrogative. It is interesting to note that while K.¹ treats it as a relative, K.² treats it as an interrogative. This latter view involves a sort of break in the thought which, I think, is rather harsh, since after *quo* in this sense we should expect *quam ad tellurem quae* rather than *quam quae. . .tellus* in 30. (K.² softens this somewhat by supplying *ad eam terram* as antecedent to *quae*, i. e. *quae tellus*.) The march of the thought would be as follows: 'Could there be any land dearer to me, or *what land is there to which* <literally, simply 'whither', *quo*> I should rather bring my ships, than that land which. . .?' The shift in the type of question, from the more specific to the more general, need not give us pause: we can parallel it, with 6. 532–533 (see note 61), perhaps with 10.670 (note 61), and possibly with 1.8–9 (note 498). But the interpretation offered above, which takes *quo* as a relative, would seem preferable, as being both simpler and smoother.

in the same construction as the *cui* clause in 204[583]. This is the view of H., as shown by his punctuation[584], and of P., as shown by his note[585].

The *unde* clause and, probably, the *quo* clause in the two preceding examples, unlike the majority of such instances, are adjectival. Finally, we find a *cum* clause, thoroughly adverbial, used as a parallel, not to a true adjective, but to a participle[586], in G. 1.438 sol. . .et *exoriens* et *cum* se *condet*[587]. This may be regarded as a fusion of *cum exorietur et cum se condet* and *exoriens et se condens*. It goes without saying that this combination of the adjective modifier and the adverbial clause is rendered possible because of the time relation —almost adverbial—involved in the participle. (On this compare below, 164.)

3. ADVERBS AND NON-ADVERBS[588]

a. ADVERB AND CLAUSE[589]

Very similar to the preceding example, but with the participle expressing time replaced by a true adverb of time, is 6.827 concordes animae *nunc* et *dum nocte premuntur*. Here, however, we may consider *et* epexegetical[590], since the two expressions are synonymous, not antithetical.

We may note, too, G. 1.420–422 pectora motus *nunc* alios, alios[591]

---

[583]See 137.

[584]He places parentheses around *non ullo. . .iuvencis*. This manner of pointing I consider superior to that of C. and P., who use semicolons, although, in my desire to present C's. view fairly, I have copied the latter method.

[585]The return to the original construction after the interruption provided by *non ullo. . .iuvencis* may seem dubious (compare note 418). But C's. alternative suggestion, that *aut* may refer to *non ullo ex aequore*, appears to me objectionable, inasmuch as it involves a very cumbersome ellipsis before *unde*, that of *quam ex illo aequore*.

[586]Compare note 470.

[587]Compare the coordination of a temporal clause with an ablative of time, G. 1.287–288 (98); with a prepositional phrase, 11.661–662 (100); and with an adverb, 6.827 (139).

[588]For combinations of adverb and noun, see 126–127; of adverb and adjective, 127–129.

[589]Summing up for clauses here as we did for prepositional phrases above (note 509), we may note that we have observed examples of the coordination of a clause with a noun, 87–99; with a prepositional phrase, 99–100; with an infinitive, 35–36 (examples involving the historical infinitive, cited on 31–32, scarcely count as anomalous); with an adjective, 129–139; with a participle, 137–138, 139; with an adverb, 139–140.

[590]Unless, with Bentley, we adopt the reading *prementur*, which is not without MS. authority.

[591]'Connective repetition'; compare note 46. The use of the word *alios* twice over, implying a contrast as it does, gives much the same effect as that type of repetition that may be termed 'connective variant repetition': for this see note 551, on *parte. . .partem*, in 5.187. Other examples of contrasting members which

dum nubila ventus *agebat*, concipiunt. Clause and adverb are very similarly coordinated, though not connected, in 2.21–23 Tenedos, notissima fama insula, dives opum Priami *dum* regna *manebant*, *nunc* tantum sinus et statio male fida carinis (already listed above, 114, in another connection).

Of the same type is 4.627 *nunc*, *olim*, *quocumque dabunt* se tempore vires, unless, as is possible, *quocumque* is to be regarded, not as coordinate with *olim*, but as explanatory of it. In that case, however, we should, I think, have to omit the comma that C., H., and K. all place after *olim*, or adopt some other device to show that *quocumque* belongs more closely with *olim* than with *nunc*. Still another possibility is that *quocumque* in thought sums up both *nunc* (relating to the present or more immediate future) and *olim* (relating to some remote future).

---

are joined by their very contrast are 2.21–23 (cited immediately after G. 1.420–422), and 1.209 spem vultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem (for which see 8). Compare, too, what is said in note 342 concerning the correlative use of *olim*. . . *nunc* (in 12.210–211), *nunc*. . .*tum* (in 8.99–100 and 12.134–135), and *post*. . .*tum* (in 9.387–388). For the repetition *alios*, *alios*, we may compare *iam*. . .*iam* in 2. 310–312 (cited on 191) and *hic*. . .*hic* in 6.479–480 (cited on 198).

PART II

MEMBERS PARALLEL GRAMMATICALLY BUT NOT LOGICALLY

We now turn to the coordination of members parallel *grammatically* but not *logically*[592]. Compare page 5.

A. EXAMPLES INVOLVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF TERMS

1. CONCRETE AND ABSTRACT

We may note here first the collocation of a concrete and an abstract idea[593], a combination which in English is used mainly for comic effect[594].

---

[592]Some of the examples treated in Part II really belong to either or both divisions, as was remarked in note 31 (compare note 18). For instance 1.639 *arte* laboratae vestes *ostro*que superbo is listed here (148) as the combination of an abstract and a concrete, but it might just as well have been listed above (7–9) as the combination of an ablative of manner and an ablative of means. Also, a number of the categories into which this large class may be divided overlap to a considerable extent (compare note 752). When we pass from the realm of grammatical form to that of underlying thought, it is no longer possible to maintain a mathematically exact system of classification. An observation of the method of treatment employed in this part of the work, or a glance at the table of contents, will reveal how great a loss of rigid precision must perforce be incurred as we cross the bounds separating the divisions. For instance, the same passage may serve at once as an example of the correlation of the abstract and the concrete, and of the internal and the external (compare 152). We thus imperceptibly pass from one group into another. Again, pairs of quite different natures may yet illustrate the same type of inconcinnity. For example, two nouns or two adjectives, or a combination of noun and adjective (as 2.86–87, for which see 164), or two verbs (as 4.445–446, for which see 170–171), may in the same manner and to the same degree exemplify the combination of the permanent and the temporary (compare 161–171). Our purpose would be defeated did we separate them. That is why in Part II scarcely any distinction is made between nouns and adjectives (compare note 55); nor is a separate category maintained for verbs, although for the sake of convenience the relatively few examples involving verbs or clauses are grouped in note 604. In short, the classification in this section is on the basis not of grammar, but, so far as is possible, of idea.

[593]An interesting illustration of the ancient tendency to place abstract and concrete terms on a par is to be found in Hermann Usener's Götternamen (Bonn, Friedrich Cohen, 1896) in the pages (364–375) in which he traces the evolution by which abstract ideas such as *νίκη* or *θάνατος*, attaining personality, developed into gods who took their place side by side with the genuine divinities. (Our word *divinity*, which I have just used, and its synonym *deity* as well, have doubtless gone through the same process.) This discussion was brought to my attention by Professor Ernst Riess, of Hunter College.

[594]Compare 145–146. The following examples, all more or less in humorous or satirical vein, may be cited as typical:—Charles Dickens, The Pickwick

a. CONCRETE THE OUTWARD SIGN OF ABSTRACT

Sometimes the two terms are practically synonymous in that the concrete noun is, so to speak, the outward and visible symbol or sign or manifestation of the abstract[595]. Such an expression as *house and home* in English approaches these Latin examples, although in the English example the disparity between the two nouns is not so manifest.

We may note here G. 2.155 *urbes* operumque *laborem*, and 1.504 *operi regnis*que futuris. In the first of these passages the cities, in the second the kingdoms, constitute the tangible result of the work.

In 9.98 *finem portus*que tenebunt, the harbor is the visible symbol of the long-sought goal. Perhaps we may compare with this example 2.780 longa tibi *exsilia* et vastum maris *aequor* arandum, if we consider that Aeneas's period of exile is coterminous with his wanderings over the sea[596].

Of 4.597 en *dextra fides*que, K. says that *dextra* is "the visible sign and pledge of the *fides*".

Papers, Chapter 28, "All the girls were in *tears* and *white muslin*", Chapter 35, "Miss Bolo. . . went straight home, in *a flood of tears*, and *a sedan chair*", Chapter 37, "With *this permission*, and *the street-door key*, Sam Weller issued forth", Chapter 32, "Mr. Ben Allen, who was dismally depressed with *spirits* and *agitation*"; Owen Johnson, The Varmint, 36 (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1926), "The plate. . .returned. . .laden with *prunes* and *maledictions*"; "Elizabeth" (pseudonym of the former Countess von Arnim, now Lady Russell), Love, 10 (New York, Doubleday, Page and Company, 1925), "These <rain-drops> he had to wipe off, which he did with *immense care* and *a handkerchief* that deplorably was not one of his new ones"; President Nicholas Murray Butler, in a letter published in The New York Times, August 20, 1928, 1–2, "Every bootlegger in the land will support this position, both *with eagerness* and *with a share of his very satisfactory profits*"; Louis Sherwin, Actors in Private Life (a review in The New York Sun, May 19, 1928, 19), "The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries should, above all, be written about with *gusto* and *vine leaves in the hair*"; Eugene O'Neill, Marco Millions, 113 (New York, Boni and Liveright, 1927), "Marco will soon be here, wearing *the self-assurance of an immortal soul* and *his new admiral's uniform*!"; Where Inbreeding Belies Science (an unsigned article in The New York Sun, July 10, 1928, 12), "So after spending six months collecting *breadfruit, other indigenous plants* and *habits fatal to morale*, Bligh set sail from Tahiti in April, 1789".

It is to be noted that some of these examples show the double type of inconcinnity referred to in note 592; that is, they illustrate not only a combination of abstract and concrete, but also a combination of different syntactical types. Thus the notions of manner and of means are juxtaposed in the passages quoted from "Elizabeth" and from President Butler; and these examples, therefore, could just as well have been cited in connection with the discussion above, on pages 7–9. The latter passage, in which the preposition *with* is used in two different ways, might likewise have been listed in note 66.

[595]Compare K's. note on 2.654. The particular instance to which this note applies, however, is classed here in a different category (145). Compare note 592.

[596]I am assuming that the two nouns are subjects of the same verb. This may be a part of *sum, sunt* with *exsilia* and *est* with *aequor*; the meaning then is, 'you have a long exile before you, and a vast sea that must be ploughed'. Or it may

In 3.13–15 *terra* . . . colitur . . ., *hospitium* antiquum Troiae sociique *penates*, the use of *hospitium* and *penates* as coordinates is not really logical any more than their use as appositives of *terra*[597].

As the household deities may stand for hospitality, so may the board on which the bounty is spread. Accordingly 10.460 per patris *hospitium* et *mensas* may be viewed as a parallel for the previous example.

As the table stands for hospitality, so does the wedding-chamber for marriage. A passage illustrating the combination of the latter ideas is 6.623 *thalamum* invasit natae vetitosque *hymenaeos*. There is almost a zeugma here in the use of *invasit*, which has a literal meaning with the concrete noun and a figurative one with the abstract.

With the abstract idea of marriage may also be combined the person sought in marriage, as in 3.327–328 secutus . . . *Hermionen* Lacedaemoniosque *hymenaeos*[598], 7.358 super *nata*[599] lacrimans Phrygiisque *hymenaeis*, 12.42 *natam* et *conubia* nostra petentem, 11.355–356 natam egregio *genero* dignisque *hymenaeis* des.

War manifests itself in arms[600]. We find the phrase *bello et armis* recurring several times, namely in 1.545 nec *bello* maior et *armis*, 4.615 *bello* audacis populi vexatus et *armis*, 7.235 seu quis *bello* est expertus et *armis*. On the same order are 9.598 *obsidione* . . . *vallo*que

---

be a part of *aro*, *aranda sunt* loosely used with *exsilia*, and *arandum est* strictly used with *aequor* (so says C., and K's. note is similar). Still a third possibility exists, that in the first clause the verb is *sunt* alone, and in the second the verb is *arandum est* (so F.-B.). If this is the correct interpretation, we can no longer regard *exsilia* and *aequor* as coupled, and the example should not be listed here.

[597]But an interpretation involving this seems decidedly preferable to the view of F.-B., who would supply verbs, *erat* with *hospitium* and *erant* with *penates*.

[598]In this and the two following examples, the connection between the abstract and the concrete is so close that, were the adjectives (*Lacedaemonios*, *Phrygiis*, and *nostra*) removed, we might be tempted to fancy that we had here an instance of hendiadys—which should show us how sceptically and suspiciously we should view the alleged examples of this phenomenon (compare note 3, and page 193 of the article there cited). In the third citation, for instance, even were the significant *nostra* omitted, there would still be present two distinct ideas: the possession of Lavinia herself, and then, what is far more important (despite possible sentimental protests, especially from partisans of Turnus), the alliance with Latinus and his race.

[599]*Nata* is C's. reading. If instead we accept H's. lection, *natae*, we then must regard the substantive as made correlative not with the noun *hymenaeis*, with which it is parallel grammatically though not logically, but with the adjective *Phrygiis*, with which it is parallel logically though not grammatically. Compare 116 and note 465.

[600]Or in walls. So we may compare 10.70 num puero *summam* belli, num credere *muros?* Here, by 'connective repetition' (see note 46), Vergil joins two nouns the first of which, even if it *is* used in a concrete sense, as N. says (without, however, giving any further explanation), is still distinctly less concrete than the second.

teneri, G. 4.399–400 *vim* duram et *vincula* capto tende[601], 9.399–400 qua *vi* iuvenem, quibus audeat *armis* eripere[602].

We may note further 5.484 *caestus artem*que repono, and 5.521 ostentans *artem*que . . . *arcum*que sonantem.

I am inclined to place here also 2.36–37 pelago Danaum *insidias* suspectaque *dona* praecipitare. C. says that *insidias* stands for the horse itself[603]; but to me it seems, despite the quite physical sense of *pelago. . .praecipitare*, to represent the sinister abstract force, a greater danger than its manifestation, that is back of this manifestation. With this example we may compare 8.617 deae *donis* et tanto laetus *honore*, if Heyne is right in referring *honore* to the gifts.

b. LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE APPLICATION

(1) Local Relations

A similar combination of a literal and a figurative or metaphorical use is frequently met with in pairs the members of which have no inner relationship.

We may note first an example involving clauses[604] in which an odd mixture of ideas is used with striking effect. This is 6.540–543 hic locus est partis ubi se via findit in ambas: *dextera quae Ditis magni sub moenia tendit*, hac iter Elysium nobis; at *laeva malorum exercet poenas et ad impia Tartara mittit*, where the right road is spoken of in purely literal, the left in purely figurative, terms[605].

[601]Here again, as in 6.623 (cited just above), the verb has with one complement a literal, with the other a figurative sense. P. believes that *tende* with *vim* = *intende*, with *vincula* = *contende*. In other words, there is present here what the grammarians call a zeugma. This passage may also be cited as an instance of hendiadys. All that either of these figures amounts to is simply a coordination of two elements that are logically not absolutely coordinate. See note 3.

[602]The 'connective repetition' (for which see note 166) renders this phrase a variant of the very common locution *vi et armis*, often cited as a typical example of hendiadys (on this compare note 601). The English legal expression, 'entry by *force* and *arms*', is an exact equivalent, and probably a direct translation, of this.

[603]He has the same opinion in regard to *doli* in 2.264 doli fabricator. But on this see 206. On *insidiae*, see further note 616.

[604]From the nature of the case, most of the examples listed in Part II involve substantives and adjectives. Verbs, denoting as they do simply actions and not different types of things, do not show the same manifold varieties of incongruity as name-words and epithets. But we do find a few instances in which combinations of verbs reveal corresponding peculiarities. For the sake of convenience, it may not be amiss to group them here. They are: literal and metaphorical, 6.540–543 (144); permanent and temporary, 4.445–446, 4.176–177 (170–171); primary and secondary means, 6.542–543, G. 3.459–460, G. 3.154–156, 3.448–449, 7.21–23, 7.50–51 (183–184); specific and general, 12.206–211 (186–187); actual and contingent, G. 3.498–508 (188–189); mutually non-exclusive, 6.743–744 (229–231), 9.179–180 (236). See also the examples listed on pages 221–223.

[605]Compare 12.235 vivusque per ora feretur, where the metaphorical *vivus* blends oddly with the rest, especially with the matter-of-fact *per ora*. There is a

It is among such instances that we find most examples of the sort of collocation, already referred to (141), of which Latin is so fond[606], but which English hardly ever employs except for comic effect.

A striking example is 2.654 *incepto*que et *sedibus* haeret in isdem. A literal translation of this passage would be absurd: the only acceptable way to render it is by giving two different meanings to *haeret*, although this, of course, does not imply that there is anything like a zeugma in the Latin[607]. There may, to be sure, be an instance here of grammatical non-parallelism (not doing away this time, however, with the logical inconcinnity), that is, *incepto* may be a dative and *sedibus* alone may be dependent on *in*[608]; but the two Vergilian parallels which Weidner cites[609], 5.512 Notos atque atra ⟨or alta⟩ volans in nubila fugit, and 6.416 informi limo glaucaque exponit in ulva[610], support the view that the postponed preposition *in* governs both substantives[611]. 11.469–470 *concilium*...et...*incepta* Latinus deserit furnishes a capital parallel for the preceding example if

---

sort of fusion of *vivus erit* (or *vivet*) and *fama* (*eius*, *quasi vivi*) *per ora feretur*. (Compare 4.195 dea...virum diffundit in ora, where *dea* = the personified *fama*.) We may note the words of Ennius, Epigrammata 18 (Vahlen²), volito vivos per ora virum, which undoubtedly served as a model both for this passage and for G. 3.9 virum volitare per ora. Concerning the latter passage, C., amending his original opinion (doubtless under the influence of a criticism of Munro's, made on page 279 of the review of C's. first edition cited in note 281), comments as follows: "...this would seem to be one of the passages in which Virg. shadows out more meanings than one, probably not discriminating them in his own mind as sharply as they must be distinguished by a modern commentator." (For other illustrations of Vergil's suggestive power, see note 404, 103 on 11.180–181, 210 on 2.562–563, and note 922 on 6.817–818.) As C. remarks on G. 3.9, Horace used the model afforded by Ennius rather differently in Carmina 2.20. We may also note the much more famous imitation by Horace in Carmina 3.30.6–7 non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei vitabit Libitinam, and the equally obvious, and closer, parallel in Ovid, Metamorphoses 15.878–879 ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama...vivam. I have just employed a very common form of the same type of expression by writing "in Ovid" in the sense of 'in Ovid's works'.

[606]We may compare Horace, Sermones 1.5.104 Brundisium longae finis *chartae*que *viae*que est. For examples from Cicero and Ovid, see C's. note on 2.654. I should fancy that Ovid, with his love of clever, unexpected turns of expression, would be found on investigation to employ this particular device to a greater extent than Vergil.

[607]Compare on 6.623, page 143. [608]Compare the examples on 15–16.

[609]To which we may add 6.692 quas...terras et quanta per aequora vectum. (A perhaps comparable instance in the realm of clauses is the postponement of the common conjunction to the second member in 11.174 esset par aetas et idem si robur ab annis.) Sophocles—whose style Vergil's resembles in many ways (compare above, 3)—seems particularly fond of this device. See e. g. Antigone 366, 1176, perhaps also 787–790 and 851 (but in both of these a doubt exists as to the reading), Oedipus Tyrannus 734, 761. Another Greek example is Apollonius Rhodius 3.757–758 ἠὲ λέβητι ἠέ που ἐν γαυλῷ κέχυται.

[610]See 16.

[611]But it should be noted that these two lines, as well as those that I have adduced, are not perfect parallels, as in no instance does the preposition follow the second noun. 5.448–449 is much closer, if *in* there governs both ablatives: but this is doubtful. See 16.

concilium, like *sedibus*, has a local signification. For *concilium* in the sense of a place of meeting, see 235. We may also compare 7.407 *consilium*que omnemque *domum* vertisse Latini; but it must be noted that *domum* is less concrete in meaning than *sedibus* or *concilium*, since it means 'household' rather than 'house'.

3.136 *conubiis arvis*que novis operata iuventus is comparable. We could not take seriously a picture in English of 'young men engaged[612] in marriage and in the fields'; but, as C. says, the juxtaposition, though "a little quaint to our notions", is reasonable enough, inasmuch as "marrying and giving in marriage and cultivation of the soil are two natural symptoms of settled life". Very similar are the verse immediately following, 3.137 *iura domos*que dabam[613], and also still another description of the founding of a civilization, 1.264 *mores*que viris et *moenia* ponet.

2.92 vitam in *tenebris luctu*que trahebam falls into the same general category.

We may note here also 1.715 *complexu* Aeneae *collo*que pependit.

(2) Causal, Instrumental, and Modal Relations

It will be noted that the preceding examples involved for the most part purely local relations. When the relations indicated are, as in the following examples, not local, but causal, instrumental, or modal, the effect produced seems to me somewhat more natural[614]. Perhaps this is because a local relationship, in comparison with any of the

---

[612]Perhaps 'engaged' is not quite a fair choice; but even 'busied with' or 'devoted to' would not give a natural effect, when applied alike to both nouns in one and the same sentence.

[613]Perhaps we may compare with this 1.426 *iura magistratus*que legunt sanctumque *senatum*. The members *iura* and *magistratus* do not belong so definitely to different realms of civilization as do *iura* and *domos*, *mores* and *moenia*, pairs in which the first member falls within the sphere of spiritual institutions, the second of material. Still, between *iura* and *magistratus* there is a distinction, since the first is abstract, the second concrete. The final term, *senatum*, belongs in the same class as *magistratus*, though, as a collective noun, it approaches a little nearer to an abstract. Here again, as in 6.623 (see 143) and G. 4.399–400 (see note 601), most editors recognize the existence of a zeugma. Of course we should in translating probably say, 'they *enact* laws and *elect* magistrates and a senate'; but perhaps we are going astray in assuming that the meaning of Latin words must be precisely coextensive with ours (compare note 66). Surely the idea of choosing (*legunt*) is present in both actions. It seems to me that the true distinction lies in the relationship of the objects to the verb. While all three are to be classed as accusatives of 'Effekt' (compare note 818), still *iura* is more definitely so than *magistratus* or *senatum*. The laws are not there at all until they have been chosen; neither are the magistrates and senators, as such, but the men from whom they are to be selected are.

[614]At least in Latin, though not necessarily so in English. Compare note 594, and page 145.

others enumerated, is, on the whole, something more physical, more concrete, and therefore appears more incongruous when ascribed to an abstract entity in the same way as to a concrete one.

Thus we accept readily enough 8.202 tergemini *nece* Geryonae *spoliis*que superbus and 7.172 horrendum *silvis* et *religione* parentum, where the nouns express cause[615] pure and simple, and 12.752 *insidiis* et *ripa* territus[616], 9.603–604 natos . . . *gelu* duramus et *undis*[617], and 6.590–591 qui nimbos et . . . fulmen *aere* et cornipedum *pulsu* simularet equorum, where the nouns express means pure and simple.

In other instances the situation is complicated by the fact that, while the concrete noun expresses simply means, the abstract noun may present a combination of instrumental and modal elements (compare note 477). The various degrees in which such elements

[615]The ablatives here may perhaps be considered to denote means rather than cause (for which see K.[1] on 1.99, and K.[2], Introduction, § 160), or specification (for which compare 12.788 and 2.799, cited on 150). In whatever category they fall, they seem to me perfectly parallel. C. would subordinate *religione* to *silvis*: he takes it as "probably referring to the awful antiquity of the grove", and offers as a paraphrase *cinctum silvis horrendis et religiosis*. But I believe the building (*tectum*, 170) arouses awe in its own right. It is called *augustum* (truly a solemn word for Vergil's own day) in 170, and further indications of its holiness are given in 173–176.

[616]An additional factor here in softening the disparity is the circumstance that *insidiis* refers directly to the *formido* (line 750 cervum. . .saeptum formidine pennae). It has even been said that the word *insidiae* itself, like *formido*, has actually a concrete rather than an abstract force here; but this is doubtful. The word *insidiae* occurs twenty times in Vergil. In one passage, 2.36–37 insidias suspectaque dona praecipitare iubent, where it refers to the wooden horse, its sense is uncertain (see 144). In every other instance it *may* have an abstract force, although there are three passages, all referring, like the one here under discussion, to hunting, where it may likewise have a concrete sense (compare the English *snare*). These passages are E. 3.17–18 te vidi. . .caprum excipere *insidiis*, G. 1.271 *insidias* avibus moliri, and 7.478 *insidiis* cursuque feras agitabat. In the first of these P. gives an abstract translation, "lie in wait to catch"; and in the third the presence of *cursu* suggests that *insidiis*, too, may be abstract, although the examples cited in this very section, e.g. G. 3.20 *cursibus* et crudo decernet Graecia *caestu* (149), 9.559 *cursu telo*que secutus (148), and 12.890 non *cursu*,. . .certandum est. . .*armis* (149), show us that there is danger of basing too much on such an argument. On the whole it is probably safer to say that *insidiae* has a primarily abstract sense in these three passages (as it certainly has in two other passages that deal with hunting, E. 5.60 and G. 3.537), and likewise in 12.752. This is apparently K's. view, if we may judge from the fact that he includes no strictly concrete meaning in his Vocabulary.

[617]C. regards this as an instance of hendiadys, but the coordination of the two nouns is easily explained. Two distinct means by which the hardening process is accomplished are here present: the actual waters (concrete) and the cold temperature (abstract). It is merely incidental that the quality denoted by the abstract noun is possessed by the concrete noun. Perhaps we may also say that the waters apply or furnish the cold, as they do the oblivion in 6.715 securos *latices* et longa *oblivia* potant (179). But there the incongruity is greater, since *latices* is used literally and *oblivia* metaphorically (compare note 772), whereas here the abstract is just as literally used as the concrete. A better parallel in this respect is 6.230 spargens *rore* levi et *ramo* felicis olivae (182), since the branch quite literally applies the dew; but here the distinction between abstract and concrete is lacking.

may be present in the abstract noun are well represented by a group of examples which are decidedly similar so far as their concrete nouns and their verbs are concerned. In 9.559 *cursu telo*que secutus, the concept of means predominates. On the other hand, in 10.713 *iaculis* tutisque procul *clamoribus* instant, and in 10.716 *missilibus* longe et vasto *clamore* lacessunt, the idea of manner seems to me to be at least as strong as that of means: the shouts may be used as a further instrument for instilling terror in the pursuit of the bear to whom Mezentius is likened, but scarcely so in that of Mezentius himself, since he is hardly a type to be terrified by mere sound and fury. Finally, in 10.692 *odiis*que viro *telis*que frequentibus instant, *odiis* expresses manner pure and simple, without any suggestion at all of the notion of means.

We may consider similarly a second group of three examples[618], in which again the concrete noun expresses means and the abstract noun shifts from the notion of means to that of manner. In this second group the common factor is the abstract noun, which remains unchanged, although, as has just been said, it varies in category. These three examples are 8.226–227 saxum, *ferro* quod et *arte* paterna pendebat[619], 1.639 *arte* laboratae vestes *ostro*que superbo, and 11.760–761 *iaculo* et multa prior *arte* Camillam circuit. The ablative *arte* in the first of these instances expresses means; in the second, manner (as is suggested by the translation in K., "artistically, cunningly"); and in the third, a cross between the two.

The idea of means likewise shades off into that of manner, in the concrete as well as in the abstract member[620], in 8.481–482 superbo

---

[618]It must be noted, however, that a quite different analysis is possible for two of these examples. In 1.639 both C. and K.[1] (though K.[2] abandons this view) take *ostro* as parallel not with *arte* but with *laboratae* (see 118); and in 11.760–761 K. takes *iaculo* as parallel not with *arte* but with *prior* (see 121). For still another interpretation of the latter passage, see 149. I am assuming for the moment that C. is right in his view of this passage. He couples *iaculo* and *multa*... *arte*. I am not quite sure whether he regards these words as modifying *prior* (which he interprets as meaning *φθάσας*, 'anticipating') or *circuit*; but the sense is much the same in either case.

[619]Despite the fact that this is the one example of the three in which the concrete and the abstract nouns are indubitably to be regarded as coordinated, and are indubitably to be assigned to the same category (that of means), this particular pair seems to me the most incongruous of the three. It is this incongruity, doubtless, that led C. to offer as a paraphrase *ferro per artem paternam pendebat*.

[620]The noun *armis* alone, as in the very common phrase *vi et armis* (on which see note 602), might denote only means. But the introduction of the descriptive adjective *saevis*, like the introduction of the adjective *larga* in the phrase *larga*... *manu*, in 10.619–620 (for which see 153), seems to make the phrase modal rather than instrumental in its scope. The phrase *saevis*...*armis* in 12.890 (cited just below, page 149) is not quite the same. Here the addition of the adjective does

imperio et saevis tenuit Mezentius *armis*. The same combination of ideas—modal-instrumental—seems to be implicit in the ablative absolute in 10.431 agmina concurrunt *ducibus*que et *viribus* aequis. With this we may compare the ablative absolute in 5.808–809 Pelidae . . . congressum Aenean nec *dis* nec *viribus* aequis, which in force is modal-adversative.

The abstract noun expresses manner only in G. 2.160 *fluctibus* et *fremitu* adsurgens Benace marino. Here the concrete seems to express means shading off into still another category, that of specification[621].

A similar combination of the notions of means and specification is exhibited by the concrete and the abstract nouns in G. 3.20 *cursibus* et crudo decernet Graecia *caestu*, and in 12.890 non *cursu*, saevis certandum est comminus *armis*[622]. It is possible to say the same thing of the example quoted three paragraphs back, 11.760–761 *iaculo* et multa prior *arte* Camillam circuit, if we accept there instead of C's. interpretation the view of Gossrau and Peerlkamp, and regard the expression as similar to *pietate prior* in 11.292.

On the same order are 11.124 o *fama* ingens, ingentior *armis*[623], 11.641 ingentemque *animis*, ingentem *corpore* et *armis*, 11.291 ambo *animis*, ambo insignes praestantibus *armis*, 6.403 Aeneas, *pietate* insignis et *armis*. In all four of these, both abstract and concrete members belong to the same mixed type, expressing partly specifica-

---

not alter the type of ablative. However, it of course adds something to the effect, since Aeneas, in taunting Turnus, doubtless aims at intensifying the cowardice of which he is accusing him, and the fear with which he is inspiring him, by emphasizing the fell character of the weapons which his victim is seeking to avoid. However, the adjective is certainly not used so significantly, so *personally*, so to speak, as in 8.482; and thus *saevis* here falls midway in force between *saevis* in 8.482, where the adjective seems to have full value, and *saeva* in 9.651, where I think it is a mere stock epithet (see note 808).

[621]It is often hard to distinguish between the ablative of means and that of specification, whether or not they are allied in origin. (According to Harkness, § 472, the ablative of specification is a special variety of the instrumental ablative. G.-L., however, classify the ablative of means as a variety of the "ablative of the thing wherewith", § 401; the ablative of specification as a variety of the "ablative of the place whence", § 397. But both authorities wisely warn us that no classification will suit all cases: see Harkness, § 459, Note, G.-L., § 384, Remark. Compare also Bennett's comment, in Syntax of Early Latin, 2.279–280, already cited in note 33, on the way in which the various types of ablatives have been fused, no matter what their origin. See, too, Stolz-Schmalz[5], 420.)

[622]While the ablatives are not connected, they are coordinated by the contrast existing between them. Compare notes 551 and 591, and, to a less degree, note 623, for other instances of pairs balanced by the adversative relationship existing between their members.

[623]The use of the same adjective in different degrees of comparison provides a sort of 'connective variant repetition'. See note 551. This is hardly different from the ordinary type of 'connective repetition' exhibited by the two following examples. Compare note 46.

tion, partly means or cause; but I think there are variations in the degree in which the different ideas are emphasized. In the first, *fama* and *armis* seem much alike in the precise type of relationship conveyed (though they differ in another respect, for which see below, 158). In the second, *animis*, *corpore*, and *armis* are all perfectly parallel[624]. In the third, *animis* is used much as *animis* is in the second; and in the fourth, *armis* is used much as *armis* is in the first and the second. But the idea of means or cause seems decidedly stronger than that of specification in the concrete member of the third, and in the abstract member of the fourth. This is due to the fact that both of these terms, instead of being neutral as are the others, denote positive distinctions, *armis* because of its defining modifier *praestantibus*, *pietate* because of its meaning. With the last example we may compare 1.531 terra antiqua, potens *armis* atque *ubere* glaebae, and 5.431 hic *membris* et *mole* valens[625]. In both of these, as in 6.403, the abstract noun (*ubere*, *mole*) seems to denote a combination of cause (or means) and specification, while the concrete noun (*armis*, *membris*) denotes primarily specification.

Finally, specification pure and simple is expressed by abstract and concrete alike in 12.788 *armis animis*que refecti and 2.799 *animis opibus*que parati.

c. CORPOREAL AND INCORPOREAL ATTRIBUTES

With the preceding examples, in which an abstract element is made parallel with concrete objects such as arms, we may compare 5.508 pariterque *oculos telum*que tetendit. It is true that the eyes (*oculi*) are not abstract in the same sense as, for instance, the spirits (*animi*); but they are assuredly not concrete in the same sense as the weapon with which they are coupled. It is, indeed, rather the gaze of the eyes than the actual physical orbs that the poet indicates here.

---

[624]The discrepancy in meaning between *animis* and *armis* is bridged over by *corpore*, which in one sense corresponds closely to *animis*, and in another to *armis*. (For other examples of transitions, see note 441.) On the one hand, *corpore* belongs naturally with *animis*, as its antonym; and *corpore* and *animis* have this in common, that both are parts of the man concerned, whereas *armis* represents an external object (compare 152–154). But on the other hand, *corpore* also belongs naturally with *armis*, as a factor in physical prowess; and *corpore* and *armis* have this in common, that both are concrete in force, whereas *animis* is abstract.

[625]In 5.431 there is present a complicating element in that an internal relationship exists between the two members of the pair. The quality denoted by *mole* is possessed primarily by the concrete entities denoted by *membris*. Compare 9.604 (cited on 147), where the quality denoted by *gelu* is possessed by the concrete entity denoted by *undis*, as is remarked in note 617.

Vergil particularly likes to couple in the way just indicated some incorporeal attribute of man, as his gaze, his voice, his life-breath, with some physical entity, very often, as in the following examples, a member of his body, and, by a quaint conceit, to apply the same words indiscriminately to both. Thus arises a sort of zeugma, as in the example just given, in which *tetendit* is used in a literal sense with *telum* and in a more figurative sense with *oculos*[626]. In the same double sense *tendo* and *portendo* are used of the eye in conjunction with the hand. This is done explicitly in 12.930–931 *oculos dextramque* . . . protendens, and implicitly in 2.405–406 ad caelum tendens ardentia *lumina* frustra, *lumina*, nam teneras arcebant vincula *palmas*. Elsewhere, as mentioned above, it is the voice that is combined with some physical member. This member may be the hand, as in 2.688 *palmas* cum[627] *voce* tetendit, 3.176–177 tendoque . . . ad caelum cum[627] *voce manus*, 10.667 cum[627] *voce manus* ad sidera tendit (all three extremely like the two preceding examples); or it may be the foot, as in 2.378 *pedem* cum[627] *voce* repressit[628].

Again, we find the voice treated, as C. says, as if it were a separate organ, in G. 4.525–526 *vox* ipsa et frigida *lingua*[629], a miseram Eurydicen! *anima* fugiente vocabat. Here there is not only an actual coordination of the voice and the tongue; there is also a tacit coordination of the voice and the soul, where, as P. says, the *vox*, the " 'mere voice' ", continues to call "though the soul had fled". Once more *vox* and *anima* are coupled in 10.347–348 pariterque loquentis *vocem animam*que rapit traiecto gutture. Here, where *anima* practically = 'life', we may say that the *vox* is coupled with an entity not more but less concrete than itself, as it certainly is in 2.534 nec *voci iraeque* pepercit, where it is associated with an emotion.

However, with respect to *anima* we must not forget that to the ancients[630] the vital principle, the *anima* or the *vita*, was itself some-

---

[626]Compare on 6.623 (143) and G. 4.399–400 (note 601). It is perhaps worthy of note that in the latter passage the verb is the same as in the one here under discussion.

[627]I include examples of this type because, as K. says on 2.72 (cited on 152), "*cum* with the abl. often = *et* with a case parallel to that just used".

[628]Compare Euripides, Electra 592–593 ἄνεχε χέρας, ἄνεχε λόγον, and Rudyard Kipling, Puck of Pook's Hill, 180 (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), "His *legs* trembled like his *voice*".

[629]We might perhaps say that the *lingua* is the cause that produces the *vox*: see 183. I think that is the way to handle 3.457; but it seems less picturesque and poignant here.

[630]Especially to Lucretius, of course; but to a less extent to Vergil too. See again below, 202, on 6.817–818.

thing fairly concrete and physical, quite as much so, at times, as the *vox*. But it could hardly be considered so concrete as the *sanguis*[631], and therefore we may undoubtedly class among the instances grouped here 2.532 *vitam* cum[632] *sanguine* fudit[633]. Rather like this is 4.621 hanc *vocem*[634] extremam cum[632] *sanguine* fundo.

Finally, in 2.210 oculos suffecti *sanguine* et *igni*, we find *sanguis* combined with another rather incongruous entity[635]. *Ignis*, it is true, is not normally to be viewed as an abstract noun; but here it is certainly used not in its literal concrete sense, but metaphorically. Real fire is of course not meant in the same way that real blood is meant. On the other hand, in 2.72 *poenas* cum *sanguine* poscunt, *sanguine* itself in much the same way approaches an abstract sense, meaning 'bloodshed' rather than 'blood'. On this figurative use of a concrete noun, as a result of which it becomes less concrete, we may compare what was said above (150) of 5.508 *oculos telum*que tetendit.

2. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL

a. PART OF MAN AND EXTERNAL OBJECT

The passage just referred to, 5.508 *oculos telum*que tetendit, and also some of the other examples cited, e. g. 12.788 *armis animis*que refecti, 2.799 *animis opibus*que parati, 5.809 nec *dis* nec *viribus* aequis, 10.431 *ducibus*que et *viribus* aequis[636], besides representing a combination of abstract and concrete entities, likewise exemplify a disparity of another type. In each instance, of the two elements present, the one (*oculos*, *animis*, *viribus*) is within, or a part of, the

---

[631]Even though it shares the color of blood in 9.349 purpuream vomit ille animam. That is, it does so provided the reading *purpuream* is correct. The reading *purpureum* is referred to by Servius and adopted by H., but C. argues against it—rightly, I think.

[632]Compare note 627.

[633]With this I am tempted to compare 10.908 undantique *animam* diffundit in arma *cruore*. The general situation is precisely the same, and *cruore* seems to correspond with *cum sanguine*; but, since *cum* is absent, the ablative here must be regarded as instrumental or local (compare note 33).

[634]Here *vox* is used in quite a different sense from that which it has in the instances cited in the preceding paragraph. It means 'words', not 'voice'. If *cum* in 7.420 his *se* cum *vocibus* offert denotes not manner but actual accompaniment, we may compare this passage, where the voice (words) is coupled not with a single part of the body but with the entire person. Ovid's fugit cumque ipso verba inperfecta reliquit (Metamorphoses 1.526) is just the reverse of this.

[635]The effect is somewhat similar to that produced by 2.534, quoted two paragraphs back.

[636]For the first two, see 150; for the last two, 149. Compare further 11.124, 11.641, 11.291, and 6.403 (all cited on 149); and see especially note 624 on 11.641, and note 661 on 11.124.

person or persons involved; the other (*telum, armis, opibus, dis, ducibus*) is outside the person or persons. In other words the one is internal, the other external. Laying aside our consideration of abstract and concrete, we shall now consider this new distinction.

We shall note first several other examples which, like the five just cited, involve some part, physical or mental, of the human being.

(1) Corporeal Part of Man

An example is 4.517–519 ipsa *mola manibus*que piis . . . unum exuta pedem vinclis, in veste recincta, testatur . . . deos. It seems simplest to recognize inconcinnity of logic only, not of grammar. Assuredly *mola* is an ablative of means, and so, too, I think, is *manibus*, though C., who does not comment on the construction of *mola*, calls *manibus* a 'modal' (not an 'instrumental') ablative[637]. Dido's hands are used as an instrument in the rites, whether in scattering the meal just referred to, or in making pious gestures[638].

On the other hand, in the very similar passage 10.619–620 tua larga saepe *manu* multisque oneravit limina *donis*, it is quite possible to recognize in *larga. . .manu* an ablative of manner, since 'with a liberal hand' can well mean 'liberally', though I doubt whether 'with pious hands' in 4.517 can mean simply 'piously'. In this connection it must be noted that in the latter passage *manibus* as well as *piis* must have an important connotation: otherwise why should it occur with *testatur*? But in 10.619–620 *manu* fits in naturally, closely, and inconspicuously with the verb *oneravit*, while it is rather the adjective *larga* that has the stress (we may remark its perhaps significant position, as the last word of the line). Yet, in spite of what has just been said, we may recognize in this passage, too, a pair of ablatives of means, in which case *manu* here is certainly, as *manibus* in the previous passage was perhaps, a sign of the indirect means, while *donis* is a sign of the direct means[639].

(2) Incorporeal Part of Man

When the word denoting a part of the person concerned refers to his mind or his spirit rather than to any physical member, we should expect to find it more abstract than the term coordinated with it.

---

[637]F.-B. take both words as ablatives of accompaniment, but this seems to me highly untenable.

[638]To be sure, there is always the possibility that *manibus* is an ablative of quality (especially if, as C. says, *piis* = *puris*) parallel with *unum exuta pedem vinclis* and, in a sense, with *in veste recincta*; but then the employment of *-que* would, it seems to me, be too illogical even for Vergilian usage.

[639]Regarded from this point of view, these two examples are listed again below, 182. See also note 776.

This is true of the two examples already cited (152), 12.788 *armis animis*que refecti and 2.799 *animis opibus*que parati[640]. It is true to a less degree of 4.649 *lacrimis* et *mente* morata, where the word denoting the outer object indicates the manifestation of the mental state. But there are a few passages in which the second term denotes the subject of mental action, and is even more abstract than the word denoting the seat of such action. These passages are 9.311 *animum*que gerens *curam*que virilem; and 4.528 lenibant *curas* et *corda* oblita laborum, and its almost exact duplicate[641] 9.225 laxabant *curas* et *corda* oblita laborum[642].

Possibly a term denoting a plan is sufficiently like one denoting the mind, the thoughts[643], to be included with the foregoing group. If so, we may list here 5.678 piget *incepti lucis*que, a particularly interesting combination of the internal and the external. Both the *inceptum* and the *lux* are irksome, the first because the persons involved are guilty of it, the second because it beholds and illuminates their guilt[644]. In other words the first term is *subjective* in its application, the second *objective*. This brings us to a new division of our subject.

b. SUBJECTIVE AND OBJECTIVE

(1) One Member Made Parallel to the Other by Metonymy

An example that is probably to be listed under combinations of subjective and objective nouns is G. 2.174–175 res antiquae *laudis* et *artis* ingredior. The phrase is rather vague, as is C's. paraphrase, "things which have been from antiquity the subject-matter of praise and art"; and it is hard to be sure of the precise sense of *res* or of

---

[640]It was for this reason that they had already been listed as an example of abstract-concrete combinations, 150. On this overlapping of categories see note 592.

[641]O. and H. bracket 4.528 as a mere echo of 9.225.

[642]The line—with either *lenibant* or *laxabant*—presents an additional irregularity in that the second *corda* is accompanied by the proleptic participle *oblita* (*laborum*); *curas* could not possibly have a balancing modifier, since the result of assuaging or relaxing anxieties is their diminution or complete disappearance. Thus the two complements do not bear exactly the same relation to the verb; in other words there is almost a zeugma.—To be sure we might construe the sentence quite differently, regarding *corda* as nominative, not accusative, and *oblita* as a verb, not a participle; but the abrupt change of subject thus involved seems extremely unlikely, especially in such slowly-moving and smoothly-flowing passages as the two in question (compare notes 167 and 181).

[643]K. uses this word to interpret *mente* in 4.649.

[644]10.504–505 *spolia* ista *diem*que oderit is just a little like this. Turnus will hate both the spoils which he won, and the day on which he won them. But the example really belongs elsewhere: it is cited below, 182, and it might also have been listed above with combinations of concrete and abstract.

the precise force of the genitives[645]. If C. is right in taking *artis* of agriculture, not of poetry, this word would seem to be different from *laudis* in its application. I am inclined to believe that *laudis* is an objective and *artis* a subjective genitive: the undertakings (*res*) merit or receive praise (from others than those engaged in them), and involve or manifest skill (on the part of those engaged in them). On the other hand, it must be remembered (1) that one's decision as to whether a given genitive is subjective or objective frequently depends on the interpretation that one assigns to the noun limited by the genitive; (2) that in this instance the limited noun is a word notoriously difficult to interpret, namely, *res*[646]; (3) that perhaps this noun, since it does not involve a distinctly verbal idea, can under no circumstances be combined with a genitive objective in force. Then, too, *laudis* as well as *res* is susceptible of more than one meaning. The primary significance of this word is of course 'praise', but from this it is only a step to 'glory', which may be looked upon as the cause of praise, or just possibly as the result of praise[647]. P. takes *laudis* here in this secondary sense, and translates "a task of ancient fame and skill"[648]. Fame is more objective than skill; but, inasmuch as it denotes a quality, it differs less from 'skill' than does the verbal noun 'praise'. In syntax as well as in meaning, the two genitives form a much more natural pair in accordance with P's. explanation: both are subjective, or, perhaps, qualitative.

The same doubt exists with respect to the meaning of the word *laudes* in 8.287–288 carmine *laudes* Herculeas et *facta* ferunt. This passage, like the preceding one, becomes smoother if we interpret the word not in its primary sense of 'praise' but in its secondary sense of 'glory'[649]. Here again the distinction between a subjective and an objective genitive is involved: this time the genitive concerned is the word depending on *laudes*, whereas in the earlier instance it was *laudis* itself. If *laudes* means 'glory', the adjective *Herculeas* repre-

---

[645]Compare the similar question that arises with respect to 8.287–288 (155–156) and to 12.531–532 (212–213), and the not wholly dissimilar question that arises with respect to 1.446–447 (160). On the distinction between subjective and objective genitive in general, see note 650.

[646]Compare Potts's well-known definition of *res* as "a blank cheque, to be filled up from the context to the requisite amount of meaning" (Alex. W. Potts[6], Hints towards Latin Prose Composition, 32, London, Macmillan and Co., 1902).

[647]Compare note 654.

[648]On P's. view see further below, 157–158.

[649]Another variety of this secondary meaning, 'glorious deeds', might seem a better parallel for *facta*; but the trouble is that this makes the relationship of the two nouns too close, since *laudes* would then practically include *facta*.

sents a subjective genitive with both *laudes* and *facta* alike; but if *laudes* means 'praise', the genitive represented is subjective with *facta* only, and objective with *laudes*, which seems decidedly harsh[650].

With this passage we may compare 10.281–282 nunc magna referto[651] *facta*, patrum *laudes*, if the nouns *facta* and *laudes* are to be regarded as coordinate[652].

Another instance in which we can soften an existing inconcinnity between two terms by recognizing a shift in one of the two terms from its root meaning is 1.25–26 necdum etiam *causae* irarum saevique *dolores* exciderant animo. This appears rather odd inasmuch as it seems to involve a fusion of *causae irarum saevorumque dolorum* (purely objective) and *irae saevique dolores* (purely subjective). However, the connection becomes easier if we accept the view of C.

---

[650]It might be argued that the Romans would have felt this harshness less than we, since they did not recognize various categories of genitives so definitely as we alien grammarians do (compare note 33). But the difference between the subjective and the objective genitive seems fundamental, and that they were well aware of it is proved by the fact that they distinguished between the two when they employed pronouns instead of nouns, regularly using the possessive adjective for the former and the genitive of the pronoun for the latter (compare G.-L. § 364 and Note 2). However, Vergilian passages exist in which the same word seems to do duty at once as a subjective and as an objective genitive. Thus in G. 3.163–164 tu quos ad studium atque usum formabis agrestem iam vitulos hortare, the adjective *agrestem* probably plays this double rôle: see the discussion of the passage below, 161. Again in 8.356 reliquias veterumque vides monimenta virorum, *virorum* is subjective genitive with *reliquias* and objective genitive with *monimenta*. With this we may compare 7.577 medioque in crimine caedis et igni, unless we accept Heyne's reading *ignis* (which, however, is opposed by the testimony of the MSS. and of Servius, and which I am inclined to reject on the basis of the theory that the harder reading is likely to be the correct one). My view as to the meaning of the phrase is presented in note 726. In accordance with this view, *caedis* is objective genitive with *crimine* and subjective genitive with *ignis*. Finally, to these Latin instances we may add an English example, "Chassey's *presentation* and prolonged *visit*—her seeing the queen". Here the words *her seeing the queen* make plain the meaning of *presentation*, and we may therefore be sure that *Chassey's* is an objective genitive with *presentation*, while of course it is a subjective genitive with *visit*. The passage is quoted, without indication of its definite location, from The Letters of Lady Augusta Stanley, in a review of this collection written by Isabel Paterson and headed One Hundred Per Cent Victorian, in New York Herald Tribune Books, September 11, 1927, pages 3–4 (the citation in question occurs on page 4).

[651]On this reading see 27.

[652]N. is in doubt whether to recognize apposition or asyndeton here. He considers either "somewhat harsh". I think asyndeton is far more suited to Turnus's mood and circumstances. He is harried and hurried. Naturally, he wants to say as much as possible, in as few words as possible. A phrase in apposition is unnecessary grammatically; it adds little psychologically. It is more effective to think of *facta* and *laudes* as representing two distinct factors of their fathers' greatness—the *facta* to be emulated at once, the *laudes* to be shared later on as the result and reward of such emulation. It is quite in keeping with Turnus's excitement to omit a connective between the two. He has no time to waste. The same effect of haste and pressure is conveyed by the incomplete line 284, perhaps by the possible omission of *sunt* in 283 (on this see note 730).

and K., who both treat the use of *dolores* as metonymy[653], explaining the word which should mean 'pangs' as used instead to denote the cause of pangs, i. e. 'affronts'[654].

The reverse process is seen in 5.5–6 duri magno sed amore *dolores* polluto, *notum*que furens quid femina possit. In the previous instance we found *dolores* a subjective noun made coordinate with an objective (*irae*). Here, *dolores* is an objective noun made coordinate with a subjective (*notum*). It is no longer to be regarded as the cause of pangs, but almost as their result, that is, as the *thought* of the pangs (so C. and K.). We may make the expression strictly logical by couching it in purely objective terms, *duri dolores et id quod furens femina potest*. A purely subjective expression might be even more in place here, but it seems well-nigh impossible to formulate one in Latin; perhaps the effect desired might be roughly achieved by *noti dolores*[655] *notumque furens quid femina possit*. This seems to be the idea of F.-B., who say of *notum* that "its force, logically, though not grammatically, extends to *duri dolores*"[656]. The same might be said of *causae* in *its* relation to *dolores* in the preceding example.

(2) One Member the Cause of the Other

(a) Subjective Cause; Objective Result

An internal relation of a different type exists between the paired words in G. 2.174–175 res antiquae *laudis* et *artis* ingredior if we accept P's. interpretation, already referred to (155), "a task of ancient fame and skill", and his further explanation that the "task" in question includes not only agriculture (as C. thinks), but "the task of singing it, in which Hesiod long ago won *fame for his skill*" (the italics are mine). According to this view we must regard the skill exhibited *by* the poet in the art of poetry as resulting in the

---

[653]We may compare the examples cited above (144–150), in which one term is used metaphorically, the other literally. See also note 860.

[654]The same process is seen when *laus*, which primarily means 'praise', is used in the sense of 'glory', 'glorious conduct', 'the cause of praise'. Compare what has just been said (154–156) of G. 2.174–175, 8.287–288, and 10.281–282, and the further discussion below (157–158) of the first two of these passages. Note also 8. 273–274 tantarum in munere laudum cingite fronde comas.

[655]*Noti dolores* is to be understood as an '*ab urbe condita*' phrase. This is not in perfect balance with *notum. . .furens quid femina possit*. Latin can use the neuter *notum* much as we use *knowledge* in English, when the thing known is represented by a clause, as *quid. . .possit*, but not, I think, when the thing known is represented by a noun, as *dolores*.

[656]It is surprising that they do not call this hendiadys.

fame or glory that consequently accrued *to* the poet and poetry: in other words, a subjective cause produces an objective result[657].

With this we must once more[658] compare 8.287–288 *laudes* Herculeas et *facta*[659], no matter what the meaning of *laudes*, since either the *glory* won by Hercules, or the *praise* bestowed upon him, is the fruit of his great deeds.

If the sense of *laudes* here is 'fame' or 'glory', we may compare with this passage 11.444 *virtus* et *gloria*; and we may also cite as similar 11.124 o *fama* ingens, ingentior *armis*[660], since Aeneas's fame among men is occasioned at least to some extent by his prowess in arms, by which it is, however, surpassed[661].

On the other hand, if *laudes* means 'praise', there is a greater shift in view-point between the two correlated nouns than in the examples quoted in the previous paragraph; and we may then offer as a parallel 5.343–344 tutatur *favor* Euryalum *lacrimae*que decorae gratior et pulchro veniens in corpore *virtus*. Here the favor which the *others* manifest for Euryalus is mentioned side by side with his own *personal* merit (*virtus*) and the outward manifestation of his commendable qualities (*lacrimae*. . .*decorae*)[662]. This objective *favor*

---

[657]C's. interpretation (for which see 154–155) apparently recognizes no interrelation between the two nouns, since seemingly he believes that it is simply agriculture, not skill in agriculture, that is the "subject-matter of praise". I am rather inclined to agree with him.

[658]See 155–156.

[659]But not 10.281–282, also grouped with it on 156, since there is not necessarily any internal connection between the two members here. The phrase *magna*. . . *facta* doubtless refers to exploits quite distinct from those implied by *patrum laudes*. This would be in keeping with what I believe to be the spirit of the passage, which says as much as it can in the most compact form possible.

[660]Cited in a different connection above, 149.

[661]Thus from a certain point of view *armis* here, unlike *armis* in 12.788 (see 152–153), represents the internal, not the external, element. But from another point of view, the reverse is true: a man's *fama* is part of him (perhaps the most important part of him, according to ancient feelings, as shown so clearly in Ennius's epitaph and the equally well-known imitations of it, all cited in note 605); his *arma* are not, at least not to the same degree.

[662]There can be no doubt that his tears are regarded both by the spectators and by the narrator as thoroughly laudable, and even as a sign of his *virtus* in that they testify to his ambition and love of glory. Accordingly the first paragraph of 142, and also an example given on 154, 4.649 *lacrimis* et *mente*, may be cited with reference to the internal relationship of the two members of this pair, *lacrimae* and *virtus*. Incidentally, it may be noted that H. does *not* regard these two members as forming a pair, if his punctuation is to be taken as an indication. C. and K. point in such a way as to make all three members, *favor*, *lacrimae*, and *virtus*, coordinate. K.[1] obtains this effect by using no punctuation marks at all till he comes to *virtus*: C. and K.[2], on the other hand, introduce commas after both *Euryalum* and *decorae*. But H. makes a sharp distinction between the second and the third members, setting a comma after *decorae* and *decorae* alone. Hence we are probably to conclude that he does not take *virtus* as in close connection with what precedes, that perhaps he even supplies its own verb—*est*—with it.

shown to Euryalus is probably[663] in large part the result of his *lacrimae* and of his *virtus*.

In the same way in 11.539 pulsus ob *invidiam* regno *viris*que superbas[664], the hatred felt for Metabus is occasioned by his arrogant display of strength.

(b) Objective Cause; Subjective Result

On the other hand, we may also find a cause that is objective associated with a result that is subjective[665], as in G. 3.226 gemens *ignominiam plagas*que, perhaps 8.617 deae *donis* et tanto laetus *honore*[666], perhaps 1.636 *munera laetitiam*que dii[667], 4.693–694 longum miserata *dolorem* difficilisque *obitus*, 10.755–756 aequabat *luctus* et mutua Mavors *funera*, 7.552 *terrorum* et *fraudis* abunde est, G. 2.491–492 *metus* omnis et inexorabile *fatum* subiecit pedibus *strepitum*que[668] Acherontis[669], 5.334 non tamen *Euryali*, non ille oblitus *amorum*[670]. In 2.541–542 *iura fidem*que supplicis, the words *iura* and *fidem* really translate each other in terms of the objective and the subjective, the general and the specific: the external law inspires the individual's internal faith. In 1.78–79 tu *sceptra Iovem*que concilias, the *outer* force, Jupiter (which, as K. says, means Jupiter's favor), is *won over*, so that the *personal* gift, the scepter, is *won*[671]. In 9.748 neque enim is *teli* nec *vulneris* auctor, cause and result are

---

However, even if we accept this view, the general discussion of the passage will not be affected, since what has been said of the relation of *favor* with *lacrimae*... *et*...*virtus* still applies to its relation with *lacrimae* alone.

[663]Although not necessarily; for, as C. says, "it is possible that previous partiality may be meant".

[664]See again for this example 179 (where four of the preceding passages also are listed).

[665]See again below, 178.

[666]Already cited above, 144. Many of the examples treated in this division might easily be listed in more than one category. Compare note 592. In regard to linguistic phenomena, as I have already had occasion to say several times (compare notes 18, 26, 30, 31, 55, 58, 151, 302, 388), absolute exactitude of classification is impossible; there is too much overlapping.

[667]But it is hard to tell the exact meaning here, since the reading is disputed.

[668]Note that the third member of the compound object, *strepitum*, is still more objective and external than either of the others; so little does Vergil care about perfect parallelism.

[669]In the last two instances, the believer in hendiadys might offer as translations, respectively, 'false panic' (which is C's. interpretation), and 'fear occasioned by fate' (or, as C. and P. take it, 'death'); but he would lose a good deal of vividness and vigor if he did.

[670]On the doubt that may arise in connection with this example, see 178. On the 'connective repetition', compare note 46.

[671]Or, to put the matter differently, we may perhaps say that *Iovem* represents the direct or immediate result of the action implied in the verb, *sceptra* the more remote result. See on this below, 180.

indicated by two terms which are elsewhere[672], by a very readily understood metonymy[673], used as practically synonymous. The outer cause is so frequently associated with the inner result that it is hard to say where the line of demarcation runs.

(c) Subjective and Objective Terms Interacting

An interesting instance in which a subjective and an objective term react on each other mutually is 9.354 *caede* atque *cupidine* ferri. C. compares *caedis . . . cupido* in 9.760; but surely the phrase *caede atque cupidine* is far more picturesque. Euryalus is borne along on his murderous way, and with each successive killing his lust for blood is proportionately strengthened: *caedes* produces *cupido* just as much as *cupido* produces *caedes*.

We may perhaps compare 1.446–447 templum Iunoni . . . Dido condebat, *donis* opulentum et *numine* divae. Here the *dona*, provided by the worshippers, and the *numen*, provided by the goddess, have the relation to each other of cause and effect, though just which is which it would be hard to say. The passage epitomizes the whole Roman theory and practice of *do ut des*[674]. It is likewise hard to say just which term we are to regard as subjective and which as objective[675]; that depends on whether we are looking at the passage from the point of view of Dido, the builder of the temple, or of Juno, the deity for whom it was built.

(3) Miscellaneous Examples

We may note further a few passages in which there is no internal relationship between subjective and objective terms.

In 7.235 sive *fide* seu quis *bello* est expertus et *armis*[676], the entity expressed by *bello. . .et armis* exists quite independently of the man concerned, but that represented by *fide* is intimately interwoven with

---

[672]E. g., note verses 745–746 just above, *vulnus* Saturnia Iuno detorsit veniens, where we might just as well so far as sense goes, though it would have been inferior in picturesqueness, have had *telum* instead of *vulnus*. Another instance of this use is probably to be found in 2.529–530 illum ardens infesto *vulnere* Pyrrhus insequitur, where *infesto vulnere* seems to be a vivid substitute for *infesto telo* (compare 5.582 infestaque tela tulere).

[673]For other instances of metonymy, see above, 156–157 on 1.25–26, and note 654.

[674]So, too, does the phrase *pinguis. . .et placabilis ara* (7.764 and 9.585), which C. compares.

[675]On the not dissimilar difficulty that we sometimes meet in endeavoring to discriminate between the subjective and the objective genitive, compare what was said (155) in regard to G. 2.174–175.

[676]There is another, but, I think, inferior, interpretation of the passage according to which *fide* is not coordinate with *bello. . .et armis*. For this see note 390.

his own personality. This distinction is more or less obscured by C's. interpretation of the two terms as standing for friendship and war, respectively.

One's own destiny is grouped with the fame that one has won in the eyes of others[677], in 7.79 fore inlustrem *fama fatis*que[678], and 8.731 attollens umero *famam*que et *fata* nepotum[679].

In G. 3.163–164 tu quos ad *studium* atque *usum* formabis agrestem iam vitulos hortare, *studium* is a reflection of the bullocks' own point of view, *usum* of that of the farmer. The adjective *agrestem*[680] is certainly equivalent to an objective genitive with *studium*, probably to a subjective genitive with *usum*, as P. suggests by his translation, "whom you shall mould for *the pursuits and employment of husbandry*" (the italics are mine).

We may add here G. 3.498 if we accept the punctuation of Heyne, making the line run labitur infelix, *studiorum* atque immemor *herbae*. Most modern editors, e. g. C., P., and H., join *studiorum* with *infelix*; but to me Professor Homer F. Rebert's arguments[681] in favor of the other interpretation seem quite convincing.

3. PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY

a. BOTH MEMBERS NOUNS OR ADJECTIVES

The foregoing examples (cited on 152–161) have all, in various manners and degrees, illustrated the distinction between internal and external relations[682]. A somewhat similar type of distinction must now be considered. An object may *always* possess a certain *intrinsic property*, and may acquire *for the moment* some *extrinsic accidental property*[683]; it is not logical to combine as correlatives these two details. Yet such a combination is by no means uncommon, and it may often, for reasons outside the realm of strict logic, be

---

[677]We may contrast with this the examples cited above (157–158) in which the subjective element has actually produced the fame.

[678]The two ablatives are perhaps not quite parallel: the first perhaps expresses specification, the other cause or means. Compare the corresponding discrepancies exhibited by the pairs of ablatives in the examples grouped on 147–150.

[679]In the conception of both these phrases, contributing factors may have been both the alliteration and the etymological relationship of the two nouns. Compare the combination of *sacer* and *sacerdos* in 11.768, and see above, 114, for comment thereon.

[680]Compare the comment on the adjective *Herculeas* in 8.288, 155–156 and note 650.

[681]In The Classical Journal 23.539–542.

[682]Many of them at the same time illustrate the distinction considered earlier, that between abstract and concrete. Compare notes 592 and 666.

[683]Compare note 815.

even desirable. The following examples will make perfectly clear what I mean.

(1) Member Expressing Temporary Relation Attributive

We may note first 11.768 *sacer* Cybelo Chloreus olimque *sacerdos*[684]. Chloreus is always *sacer Cybelo*. Formerly he happened to be a *sacerdos* as well.

Next we may observe 5.311–312 *Amazoniam* pharetram *plenam*que sagittis Threiciis. The quiver is always of the type known as 'Amazonian'[685]; at the moment it is full of arrows. Thus the quality indicated by *Amazoniam*, and that indicated by *plenam*, are not logically coordinate, and should not, in accordance with strict logic, be combined by a conjunction[686]. However, there is some point to the use of the connective, which in thought may be said to join not *Amazoniam* and *plenam*, but *Amazoniam* and *Threiciis*; the quiver is Amazonian, and the arrows that fill it are Thracian[687], i. e., as Gossrau observes, the best of their kind. The effect, the emphasis, might have been lessened had *-que*, in accordance with the demands of strict logic, been omitted.

---

[684]This expression has already been cited (114) as an example of the correlation of an adjective and a noun.

[685]The question raised by Gossrau and C., as to whether the epithet is to be accepted literally or interpreted as merely poetical, does not affect the logic of the situation.

[686]In English we should assuredly say 'an Amazonian quiver full of arrows'. But the reluctance of Latin to combine without a connective two adjectives that refer to the same noun is well-known and widespread. On this see 169 and note 718.

[687]Just so in 11.642–643 Herminium, nudo cui vertice fulva caesaries nudique umeri (already cited, 83), the two words which are in parallel constructions are not really parallel in thought. These words, *caesaries* and *umeri*, are both subjects of some understood form of the copulative verb probably to be regarded as followed by a predicate complement, *nudo . . . vertice* in the one case, *nudi* in the other. The true balance is between the adjective modifier of the second noun, *nudi*, and the adjective modifier of a modifier of the first noun, *nudo*. The thought is, 'bare is his fair-haired head, and bare are his shoulders'. The effect both in this example and in 5.311–312 is heightened by a special device lending emphasis to the adjectives, anaphora here and chiasmus there. The anaphora here is especially striking because the adjective is repeated in a different case, and also because it follows another example of the same figure, namely 11.641 ingentem . . . animis, ingentem corpore et armis: it is as if the greatness of his spirit explains, and the greatness of his body and his weapons justifies, his rashness in thus venturing into battle unprotected. For other examples of rhetorical repetitions of the sort, see pages 12 and 168, notes 54 and 155.

We may further compare 4.47 quam tu urbem, soror, hanc cernes, quae surgere regna (discussed above, 110–111). Here *quam . . . urbem* is parallel in construction with the infinitive *surgere*, the second object of *cernes*; but it is parallel in thought with *quae . . . regna*, the subject of that infinitive. The idea is, 'What a city (it is that) you will see here, and what kingdoms (they are that) you will see rising here!'

We may compare 5.430 ille pedum *melior* motu *fretus*que iuventa. Dares is always superior to his adversary in speed, whether he is conscious or unconscious of the fact; and now in addition he gives especial thought to his youth, which thus provides an additional source of confidence[688].

(2) Member Expressing Temporary Relation Predicative

5.570–571 *extremus* formaque ante omnis *pulcher* Iulus . . . est invectus is on the whole similar to the three previous examples. Iulus is always beautiful beyond all others. He happens for the moment to be last. Of course his position in the rear troop enhances his superiority in beauty; he comes as a grand climax; he is last but not least. In this passage, furthermore, there is an additional inconcinnity in that, while the permanent epithet *pulcher* is a normal attributive modifier of *Iulus*, the temporary epithet *extremus* is used in close combination with the verb[689], and thus becomes predicative or adverbial in force. Adjective though it is, *extremus* here is practically a local modifier of the verb.

In the same way *subitum* is a temporal or a modal modifier of the verb in 2.680 *subitum* dictuque oritur *mirabile* monstrum, and in 5.522–523 oculis *subitum* obicitur magnoque *futurum*[690] augurio monstrum; and so is *improvisus* in 9.48–49 viginti lectis equitum *comitatus*[691] et urbi *improvisus* adest[692]. Likewise *inscia* in 7.381–382

---

[688]Compare 5.380 *alacris* cunctosque *putans* excedere palma, cited below, 172. See note 728 thereon.

[689]As a further example (quoted apart from the question of relative permanency) of the coordination of two adjectives of which one is more closely connected with the verb than the other, we may cite 7.501–502 questuque *cruentus* atque imploranti *similis* tectum omne replebat. Here *cruentus* is an adjective pure and simple, *imploranti similis* virtually a modal modifier of the verb: the fawn *is* blood-stained; he also *is* like one who implores, it is true, but it is particularly in his manner of filling the house with his complaining that he manifests this quality. We may note also a not dissimilar combination of an adjective and a participle, 12.856–859, quoted and discussed below, 167–168; see especially note 710. On the comparable collocation of an adjective and an adverb, see 128; on that of an adjective and an adverbial ablative, see 121 and note 487.

[690]Compare note 717. [691]Compare notes 695, 716, and 717.

[692]In 9.48–49, as K.[1] says, both adjectives = adverbial phrases; but they are adverbial phrases of different kinds. H. does not take these two adjectives as connected at all, if we may judge by his pointing of 9.47–52, which seems to indicate that he unites *comitatus* with the preceding verb *praecesserat*, and only *improvisus* with *adest*. Then *et* connects not the two adjectives but the two verbs, *praecesserat* and *adest*, and *adest* as well as *praecesserat* is introduced by *ut* in 47. (We have to wait until 52 for the main verb, *ait*, which C. and K. put into a new sentence.) It seems to me that the incongruity produced by H's. pointing is infinitely more objectionable than the one he avoids by that pointing. I should much rather join *comitatus* and *improvisus* than *praecesserat* and *adest*. The combination of the pluperfect and the present after *ut* is, to my mind, extremely harsh, and not to be justified by the combinations of *main* verbs in these tenses which are listed on 25–26.

stupet *inscia* supra *impubes*que manus is used in much the same way, except that it has no temporal implications; its force is primarily modal, perhaps to a slight degree causal[693].

To these examples of predicate nominatives we may add an example of a predicate accusative, 2.86–87 illi me *comitem* et consanguinitate *propinquum* . . . misit[694]. Sinon was already a relative when he was sent; probably he was so sent *because* he was a relative; and he was sent *to be* a companion. We must recognize a proleptic force in the noun, since he did not enter upon the state described by *comitem* until the performance of the action indicated by *misit*.

b. MEMBER EXPRESSING PERMANENT RELATION A NOUN OR AN ADJECTIVE; MEMBER EXPRESSING TEMPORARY RELATION A PARTICIPLE

(1) Past Participle

In these combinations of an inner, essential, permanent quality with an outer, accidental, temporary one, the time element often is present. It is therefore not surprising that the word expressing the mere happen-so of the moment, whether present or past, frequently belongs to the class of epithets most capable of expressing time relations, participles. To be sure, the past participle especially seems at times barely more than an ordinary adjective[695]; yet we can feel the difference when we compare it with the adjective with which it is illogically united. Thus in 7.59–60 laurus . . . *sacra* comam multosque metu *servata* per annos[696], there seems to be scant dis-

---

[693]That is, *inscia* is in a causal relation to *stupet*. Moreover, *impubes* is perhaps almost in a causal relation to *inscia*. Compare 1.475 and 6.662, page 166; also 5.380, page 172 and note 728.

[694]Here again, as in 11.768 (162) and the four passages cited on 168, one of the epithets happens to be a noun instead of an adjective. Thus all these examples present a double inconcinnity: they represent coordination of words that are non-parallel from the standpoint of grammar as well as from that of logic. On 2.86–87, see 115.

[695]Note for instance *comitatus* in 9.48–49 (163). This word has quite lost the implications of tense, as well as of voice, that its form demands, and is simply an adjective, representing, indeed, a more permanent relation than the adjective coordinated with it, *improvisus* (itself, incidentally, closely allied to a participle in formation). Compare notes 716 and 717. Another example of a participle that has become an adjective pure and simple is *nota* in 9.472 (167), which is no more a participle than *incognita* (a word which in formation resembles *improvisus*) in 12.859 (167–168). See note 709. These words, however, retain the idea of voice that should be theirs. So, for that matter, does *comitatus* if it is derived (as Wetmore thinks) not from the deponent *comitor* but from *comito*, a verb never used by Vergil in non-participial forms.

[696]Cited again below, 175.

tinction between adjective and participle; yet certainly the time element is stressed with the second and not with the first, as the phrase *multos . . . per annos* suggests.

A permanent characteristic is joined with a mere detail of attire in G. 3.17 *victor* ego et Tyrio *conspectus* in ostro, and 7.669 *horridus* Herculeoque umeros *innexus* amictu[697].

A special detail may intensify the importance of a certain numeral. We see this in 9.783 *unus* homo et . . . undique *saeptus*[698]. The man is but a single individual—this always holds good, of course; and during this particular encounter, he is hemmed in on all sides into the bargain; his single state is contrasted with the manifold dangers that beset him. Precisely as in 9.783 the effect produced by *unus* is enhanced by the participle *saeptus* (or rather by the participle *saeptus* in combination with *undique*), so in E. 2.40–41 *duo* nec tuta mihi valle *reperti* capreoli, the effect produced by *duo* is enhanced by the participle *reperti* (or rather by the participle *reperti* in combination with *nec tuta. . .valle*). Corydon offers not a single roe, but two—a handsome present; and they were hard to get, too, a circumstance which, as the commentators remind us, increases their value.

Sometimes the logical connection is found not between the two epithets[699], the one permanent and the other temporary, but between the permanent epithet and some modifier, itself relatively permanent, of the temporary epithet. The same word may be used twice, as in 10.842 = 12.640 *ingentem* atque *ingenti* vulnere *victum*[700], where the

---

[697]The whole passage, 7.666–669, runs as follows: ipse pedes, tegimen torquens immane leonis, terribili impexum saeta cum dentibus albis indutus capiti, sic regia tecta subibat, horridus Herculeoque umeros innexus amictu. It might conceivably be argued that *-que* connects *innexus* with the preceding participle *torquens* and (particularly) *indutus*; but the presence of *sic* in 668 militates against this possibility: 669 represents a general summary of what has gone before, and is thus a separate unit. In support of the view that this verse sums up the preceding lines, we may note that *horridus* repeats *impexum*, as C. points out (though it doubtless refers to the wearer's own personal appearance as well as to that of his apparel; if it did not, of course the passage would not illustrate the point in connection with which it is cited), and *Herculeo. . .amictu* repeats *tegimen. . .leonis*.

[698]I think that *et* here has genuine connective force. Compare note 295.

[699]Compare what was said above (162) on *Amazoniam* and *Threiciis* in 5.311–312. Note, too, that in the two examples just cited, 9.783 and E. 2.40–41, *undique* and *nec tuta*, respectively, are more emphatic, and do more to enhance the importance of the numerals *unus* and *duo*, than *saeptus* and *reperti*. Compare further note 861 and note 1120.

[700]5.447–448 ipse *gravis graviter*que. . .concidit, cited in N's note on 10.842, resembles this passage in the verbal repetition (see note 54) and in the relatively greater permanence of the adjective (see 128); but as an expression of inconcinnity, it belongs in a different category (see 127). So does another comparable example, 10.329–330 *septem* numero, *septena*que tela coniciunt (see 130–131).

essential idea is, not that Lausus or Murranus is *great* (a permanent condition) and *vanquished* by a great wound (a relatively temporary condition), but that *great* (permanently) is Lausus or Murranus, and *great* (also permanently) is the wound by which he is vanquished[701]. Elsewhere, words of similar meaning may be employed, as in 11.715 *vane* Ligus *frustra*que animis *elate* superbus, where probably *vane* balances *frustra* quite as well as it does *elate* (compare *nequiquam* in the following line[702]).

1.475 *infelix* puer atque *impar congressus* Achilli belongs more or less to the same type. Here, from the point of view of syntax, *atque* connects *infelix* and *congressus*; but it is *impar*, the predicate nominative, so closely united with *congressus*, that repeats the sorrow, and the negation, of *infelix*. We may perhaps say that there is a fusion here of *infelix puer quippe qui impar esset congressus Achilli* (*atque*, as K. points out, really has causal rather than coordinating force here[703]) and *infelix puer atque impar Achilli*.

Perhaps 6.662 quique *pii* vates et Phoebo *digna locuti* also belongs in this category, with the object *digna* corresponding roughly to the predicate nominative *impar*[704]. In that event we are not to supply *sunt*, which would give perfect balance with the following *qui. . .excoluere* (663) and *fecere* (664), and fair balance with the preceding *passi* (660), which, of course, is a true past participle equivalent to *qui passi sunt*[705]. We must rather supply *erant*, just as we do with *pii*. Thus *locuti* becomes virtually an adjective, referring, however, to repeated actions, whereas *pii* refers to a continuous state.

G. 2.327 *magnus* alit, *magno commixtus* corpore, fetus is, except for the omission of a connective, a much closer parallel, if *magno. . .corpore*, like *ingenti vulnere*, is to be interpreted as referring to an external entity—Earth's body, not Aether's own. (The imitation in the Pervigilium Veneris, 58 unde fetus mixtus omnis aleret magno corpore, would rather suggest that the body is Aether's; but the value of imitations as parallels seems to me, as I have already said in note 181, distinctly doubtful.) Most similar of all is 11.642–643 Herminium, *nudo* cui vertice fulva caesaries *nudi*que umeri, for which see 83 and note 687.

[701]Something in the flow of the thought seems to me particularly to recall the lines of Shakespeare quoted in note 54, "If it were so, it was a *grievous* fault, And *grievously* hath Caesar answer'd it." This, as was remarked in note 54, is a parallel for 5.447–448 (see note 700) also, in its combination of adjective and adverb; but it differs from that passage in that adjective and adverb are not used as grammatical parallels.

[702]11.716 nequiquam patrias temptasti lubricus artis.

[703]Like *neque* in 11.159 felix morte tua neque in hunc servata dolorem. On this see 175.

[704]*Digna locuti* seems to give the means of *pii*, just as *impar congressus* gives the cause of *infelix*.

[705]And parallel to *qui. . .excoluere*. See 137–138 above.

In this case the tense of *locuti* cannot be stressed any more than that of *moratus* in 12.781[706]; it is virtually equivalent to a present[707].

(2) Present Participle

More decidedly than the past participle, the present participle tends to retain its temporal and therefore temporary force[708].

In 5.179 iam *senior* madidaque *fluens* in veste Menoetēs, incongruous though the two adjectives are, they still have this in common, that each indicates a condition which intensifies the discomfort of Menoetes: as C. says, his being *gravis* (178) is accounted for partly by his age, partly by his soaked dress.

9.471–472 ora . . . *nota*[709] nimis miseris atroque *fluentia* tabo is similar. As *fluens* above reinforces *senior* in justifying *gravis*, so here *fluentia* doubtless helps *nota* in justifying *miseris*. The pitiful condition of the heads renders still more keen the grief that the Trojans feel on recognizing the remains of their former comrades.

In 12.856–859 non secus ac . . . sagitta, . . . Parthus quam . . .

---

[706]Cited on 31. See 31 and note 129, note 695 on *comitatus* in 9.48–49 (cited on 163), and 172–173, also the comments of Haverfield and P. on G. 1.206. A striking example from Horace of the use of the past participle of a deponent verb without reference to past time is to be found in Sermones 2.8.39–40 invertunt Allifanis vinaria tota Vibidius Balatroque, *secutis* omnibus. Compare also *vectis* in G. 1.206–207 quibus in patriam ventosa per aequora *vectis* Pontus et . . . fauces temptantur Abydi, and *vectos* in 6.335–336 quos simul a Troia ventosa per aequora *vectos* obruit Auster. These two instances, however, differ from the Horace passage in two respects. In the first place, the verb concerned is not a deponent, though the comments of Haverfield and P. on G. 1.206, already referred to, have to do primarily with deponents. In the second place, the action indicated by the participles *began before*, even though it was *not completed before*, that of the main verb. Haverfield and P. both regard *vectis*, and K. regards *vectos*, as equivalent to a present participle. C., however, tries to justify the tense as precisely used in both instances. An additional argument that he might have given in the case of 6.335 is that the line seems to be an echo and fusion of two verses of Catullus, in both of which the past tense of the participle is used with exactness. These are 46.10 longe *quos simul a domo* profectos (compare *quos simul a Troia* in Vergil) and 101.1 multas per gentes et *multa per aequora vectus* (compare *ventosa per aequora vectos* in Vergil). Catullus 101.1 may have had some influence on G. 1.206 also. (We may note in passing that a faint echo of Catullus 101.1 may be heard in 1.375–376 nos Troia antiqua . . . diversa per aequora vectos, in 3.325 nos patria incensa diversa per aequora vectae, and in 7.228 diluvio ex illo tot vasta per aequora vecti; and that possibly the first two of these, and also 2.716 hanc ex diverso sedem veniemus in unam, may likewise have been remotely affected by Catullus 46.10–11.)

[707]The combination with *erant* is not utterly unlike the English progressive. The meaning then is, 'men who used to be bards—pious bards, and bards who uttered words worthy of Phoebus'.

[708]That this is a tendency of the Latin language is indicated by the relative paucity of Latin adjectives in *-ns* as compared with French adjectives in *-ant* and English adjectives in *-ing*.

[709]It goes without saying that *nota* is not to be taken as a participle. It is an adjective pure and simple, just as is *incognita* in the following example, 12.856–859. Compare note 695.

torsit, *stridens* et celeris *incognita* transilit umbras[710], both epithets seem to heighten the effect of inevitable doom, applicable to the arrow and thus indirectly to the awful Fury compared with it. The victim of the arrow, hearing its whiz (*stridens*), knows that it is too late to escape; and the very fact that the missile comes from an unknown hand (*incognita*) seems to increase his helpless impotence.

We may note here three, or possibly four, examples in which the term denoting permanent character happens to be an appositional noun[711] instead of an attributive adjective as in the preceding passages.

The simplest of the four passages is 12.289–291 Messapus *regem* regisque insigne *gerentem* Tyrrhenum Aulesten . . . adverso proterret equo. Here the state indicated by *gerentem*, though continued, is not permanent in the same sense as the state indicated by *regem*. The discrepancy is softened by the verbal repetition afforded by *regis*, which, moreover, forms the true parallel in thought for *regem*[712].

7.707 agmen *agens* Clausus magnique ipse agminis *instar* is very similar, even to the verbal repetition.

12.304–306 Podalirius Alsum *pastorem* primaque acie per tela *ruentem* . . . superimminet is much harsher, since *ruentem* denotes not continued state as *gerentem* and *agens* do, but merely the action of the moment. The connected words *pastorem* and *ruentem* have apparently no point in common, except the very insignificant one that both, as K. says, "*can* be viewed as = rel. clauses". Such relative clauses, however, would themselves not be parallel in thought, inasmuch as the verb in the first would indicate continuous state, in the second progressive action[713].

12.529–530 Murranum hic, atavos et avorum antiqua *sonantem* nomina per regesque actum *genus* omne Latinos may also be included in this category, if we accept the suggestion of N., who says that *genus* "might be in apposition to 'Murranum,' as in Hor. 2 S. 5.62, 'Iuvenis Parthis horrendus, ab alto Demissum genus Aenea' "[714].

---

[710]To my mind *stridens*, designating the manner of the flight, seems more closely connected with the verb than *incognita*. Compare the examples cited on 163–164, and note 689.

[711]Compare 115–116 and note 694.

[712]For the verbal repetition, compare 9.327 *rex* idem et *regi* Turno gratissimus augur; and see, too, notes 54 and 155. For the type of coordination, see note 687.

[713]Compare 171–174.

[714]We need not go to another author for examples of this appositional use of *genus*, for instances abound in Vergil himself. Compare 6.500 Deiphobe . . ., genus alto a sanguine Teucri, 6.792 Augustus Caesar, divi genus, 6.839 Aeaciden, genus . . . Achilli, 7.213 rex, genus egregium Fauni, 12.127 genus Assaraci, Mnestheus, 12.514–515 Oniten, nomen Echionium matrisque genus Peridiae (though in the first and the last examples it is just possible that *genus* is an accusative of specification, as it certainly is in 8.114 qui genus?, and 12.25 nec genus indecores).

But I do not see how he can justify the presence of *omne*; and surely the obvious explanation—which he himself considers more probable—is that *genus* is in the same construction as *nomina*[715]. On this see further below, 196–197.

(3) Future Participle

We find two instances of the similar use of a future participle, 6.680 *inclusas*[716] animas superumque ad lumen *ituras*, and 6.758 *inlustris* animas nostrumque in nomen *ituras*. In both of these, however, the incongruity is less marked, because of the fact that the action spoken of as occurring in the future is felt as already, at the present time, destined to occur[717]. None the less, strict logic would demand the omission of *-que* in both passages, inasmuch as really *ituras* modifies not *animas* alone, but *inclusas animas* (just as in the English expression 'the good little girl'[718] the two adjectives, as our omission of a comma between them testifies, are not parallel, but, on the contrary, 'good' modifies not 'girl' alone, but 'little girl').

---

[715]Vergil seems to have a special liking for associating *nomen* and *genus*. Observe, besides 12.514–515, cited in note 714, G. 2.240 nec Baccho *genus* aut pomis sua *nomina* servat, 5.621 cui *genus* et quondam *nomen* natique fuissent, 10.149 memorat nomenque genusque. In all these the two words are coordinate, just as I think *genus* and *nomina* are in 12.529–530. Again, in 5.117 Mnestheus, genus a quo nomine Memmi, the two terms, by a form of confusion very common in Vergil, are used almost interchangeably (a *genus* should be said to be derived from a *genus*, and a *nomen* from a *nomen*). We may perhaps compare with this 10.618 nostra deducit origine nomen, where we find *nomen* used in a context which, as N. remarks, seems rather to demand *genus*.

[716]To all intents and purposes the word *inclusas*, itself a participle, may, like *comitatus* in 9.48–49 (on which see note 695), be treated as an adjective here, since the time element is practically lacking. It is not the past (transient) action, but its present (permanent) result, that is stressed here. We have perhaps a greater verbal force if we take *convalle* (line 679) with *inclusas*, but this word certainly applies at least in equivalent measure with *lustrabat* (681), as K. says.

[717]Compare 5.522 (163), where the future participle *futurum* actually has so little temporal force that it is to be classed as the permanent epithet, its parallel *subitum* as the transient one. (Again compare note 695, for a similar statement concerning a past participle.) The fact that the portent in question is to be of great significance in the future seems already a truth definitely established in the present. The reverse process is seen in such instances as 9.297–299 and 2.193–194 (for which see 26 and 30, respectively), where, because of the meaning of the verb, a present is virtually equivalent to a future.

[718]However, such a combination is rare in Latin, as it violates the unwritten law forbidding the union without a conjunction of two epithets belonging to the same noun. Compare note 686; also Servius's note on 2.392, in which he says of such a combination, "...apud Latinos vitiosum est", and C's. note on 2.543. On the similar combination without a conjunction of an adjective modifier and an ablative or a genitive modifier, see note 468; on that of two ablatives, see note 44. Of course, exceptions to the rule occur (compare again note 468). We may note as an example G. 4.355–356 *tristis* Aristaeus...stat *lacrimans*. Here I believe *tristis* is in the predicate quite as much as *lacrimans*: the sense is not, as P. translates, "'Tis sad Aristaeus who stands <weeping>", but "Tis Aristaeus who stands

c. BOTH MEMBERS PARTICIPLES

We have one very odd case, 10.707–711 de montibus altis *actus* aper, multos Vesulus quem pinifer annos defendit multosque palus Laurentia, silva *pastus* harundinea, postquam inter retia ventum est, substitit. Here two past participles, which, though not connected, are, as C. says, "grammatically correlative", refer to different periods. The action denoted by *pastus* is distinctly the earlier, and, though not really permanent, relatively far more nearly so, being of much longer duration, than that of *actus*. In other words, *actus* stands for a perfect indicative, *pastus* for an imperfect, or, if taken in connection with *actus*, for a pluperfect. In Greek *actus* would be represented by an aorist participle, *pastus* by a perfect. In short, these two participles, as C. says, "do not really correspond, neither the time nor the action spoken of being parallel"; but, as he well continues, "this is not a fatal objection in a writer like Virg."[719].

d. BOTH MEMBERS VERBS[720]

The same sort of inconcinnity in time as is revealed by the pair of participles cited in the previous paragraph may likewise be exhibited by pairs of verbs.

An instance is 4.445–446 ipsa ⟨quercus⟩ *haeret* scopulis et, quantum vertice ad auras aetherias, tantum radice in Tartara *tendit*. The tree resists the storm both because it *haeret* and because it *tendit;* but the action expressed by *haeret* is particularly appropriate in the face of the storm, and would scarcely be commented on at any other time (indeed Vergil, in accordance with his usual tendency to vitalize inanimate nature[721], makes it seem as if the resistance were actually called into being in response to the emergency created by the force of the storm), whereas the action expressed by *tendit* is always

---

sad and weeping'. Thus it seems as if *et* might have been inserted here more readily than in some of the passages in which it does occur (for examples see note 689). But the omission is made natural as a result of the separation of the two epithets by the substantive and the verb (compare note 427). Even in English, we can say, 'Sad, Aristaeus stands weeping', which means something quite different from 'Sad Aristaeus stands weeping'. Another possibility is to take *tristis* as a predicate with *lacrimans* (a quite Vergilian construction; compare *impar congressus* in 1.475, cited on 166); but the word-order is against this.

[719]Yet there have been efforts at emendation; Bentley conjectured *pascit* or *pavit*, Cunningham *pastum in*. The latter seems an enormous improvement logically (for *silva pastus harundinea* really belongs with the clause . . . *quem* . . . *defendit*. . . , and almost produces an anacoluthon when thrown into the other clause); but that is not a reason for adopting it.

[720]Compare note 604.

[721]Akin to his tendency to humanize the lower animals. On this compare notes 273 and 1084.

equally existent and equally effective. As a matter of fact, *haeret* is much more in place in the simile[722] than *tendit*, which ought logically to be subordinated to it.

In somewhat the same way, in the famous description of Fama, 4.176–177 mox sese *attollit* in auras *ingreditur*que solo et caput inter nubila *condit*[723], we find *ingreditur*. . .*solo*, true of Fama at every stage of her development, made parallel with *caput inter nubila condit*, true of her only at a certain stage—that indicated by *mox*, which, by a breach of logic, is made to apply to both verbs. Of course it is this very breach of logic to which we owe a striking antithesis: see above, 82.

4. STATE AND ACTION

Comparable to the combination of two members denoting respectively a permanent and a transient relationship is that of two members denoting respectively a state and an action. Indeed, the two categories tend to overlap[724].

a. MEMBER EXPRESSING STATE AN ABSTRACT NOUN; MEMBER EXPRESSING ACTION A VERBAL NOUN

State may be expressed by an abstract noun, and action by a verbal noun, as in 5.148–149 *plausu fremitu*que virum *studiis*que faventum

---

[722]A Vergilian simile is regularly characterized by the quality of suggestion rather than by that of cut-and-dried precision. Compare what was said in regard to the simile in G. 1.199–203 (note 181), and in regard to that in 12.856–860 (39).

[723]4.177 is repeated as 10.767, but in the latter position the verse is perfectly logical. The passage in which it occurs, 10.763–767, runs as follows:

> .....quam magnus Orion,
> cum pedes incedit medii per maxima Nerei
> stagna viam scindens, umero supereminet undas,
> aut summis referens annosam montibus ornum
> ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.

The point to be brought out here is the gigantic stature of Orion, which is shown in two ways: (1) when his feet are on the floor of the ocean at its deepest, his shoulders overtop the surface of the water; (2) when his feet are on the ground, his head reaches into the clouds. (Perhaps the words *summis referens annosam montibus ornum*, which give the commentators some trouble—see C. and N.—, are to be taken as indicating that he is on low land on his way back from the mountain-top. The fact that even there he towers to the clouds would emphasize his height, just as does the fact, mentioned in the preceding couplet, that he towers above the surface of the ocean even when walking on its lowest depths—per *maxima* Nerei stagna.) Thus here *ingreditur*. . .*solo* and *caput inter nubila condit* are absolutely parallel. The difference between the two applications of the line is brought out by the two paraphrases in K.[2]: for 4.177 "though she strides on. . ., she buries", for 10.767 "walks. . .and yet". We may observe, too, that in 10.767 the balance between the two parts is stressed by the use of *-que* . . .*et* in the sense of 'both. . .and' (compare note 579), whereas in 4.177 *-que* is connective, not correlative.

[724]Compare notes 592 and 666.

consonat omne nemus, 8.717 *laetitia ludis*que viae *plausu*que fremebant, 10.695 *vim* cunctam atque *minas* perfert caelique marisque, 8.60–61 *iram*que *minas*que. . . supera, 2.413–414 *gemitu* atque. . . *ira*. . . invadunt, 7.15 exaudiri *gemitus irae*que leonum, 11.122–123 *odiis* et *crimine* Drances infensus, 7.577 medioque in *crimine* caedis et *igni*[725], 6.255 primi sub *lumina* solis et *ortus*. The sixth and the last two examples C. calls instances of hendiadys[726]; but it seems to me they differ in no essential from the others.

b. MEMBER EXPRESSING STATE AN ADJECTIVE; MEMBER EXPRESSING ACTION A PARTICIPLE

Commoner than the examples in which the terms are substantival are those in which they are adjectival. Here again[727], from the nature of the case, we frequently find a participle combined with an adjective.

(1) Present Participle

Examples with the present participle are G. 4.93–94 ille *horridus* alter desidia latamque *trahens* inglorius alvum, 9.595–596 digna atque indigna relatu *vociferans tumidus*que novo praecordia regno, 10.209–210 *immanis* Triton et caerula concha *exterrens* freta, 5.380 *alacris* cunctosque *putans* excedere palma. In the last example the state expressed by *alacris* is probably the result of the action expressed by *putans*[728].

(2) Past Participle of Deponent Verb

We may also find coordinated with an adjective the past participle of a deponent verb, which is practically equivalent to a present

[725]There is a question in regard to the reading *igni*—a question, however, which the Oxford Classical Text ignores. Heyne reads *ignis*, which, as C. says, "would give a good sense"—in fact almost too good, if one upholds the view that the harder reading is usually the correct one. This view would certainly seem to apply here, since the MS. testimony is decidedly for *igni*, as is that of Servius also. For further discussion and arguments, see C. *ad loc.*

[726]Compare note 650 on 7.577. C. translates this passage by the words "in the midst of the furious outcry at the slaughter"; but if we consider the two members separately, we shall see that the expression need not be thus tortured. We might have alone *crimine caedis*, 'the outcry over the slaughter', or *igni caedis*, 'the heat, the tumult, of the slaughter'. The verbal noun *crimine* suggests the noise; the abstract noun *igni* suggests the general appearance and atmosphere. In regard to 6.255, C. seems to think that the first member is practically equivalent to the second, for he says, " 'Primi' = 'prima,' and 'prima lumina' = 'ortus.' " The second of these equations seems to me highly debatable.

[727]Compare note 470.

[728]See again below, 175. Compare 166, and notes 703 and 704; also note 693. If the view expressed here concerning 5.380 is correct, the verse should not be offered as a parallel for 5.430, as it has been (note 688), since *alacris* cannot under these circumstances be considered a permanent epithet like *melior*.

participle in sense and force[729]. I have noted two examples of this, neither, however, absolutely certain.

The first is 10.282–283 occurramus ad undam dum *trepidi egressi*que labant vestigia prima. N. apparently does not regard *trepidi* and *egressi* as parallels, for he places a comma after *trepidi*, thus seemingly indicating that he would supply the verb *sunt*[730]. Apparently H., too, though he omits the comma, would supply this verb, for he adopts the variant *egressis* (which N. distrusts as the easier reading), evidently regarding *vestigia* not as the object but as the subject of *labant*.

The second is 8.444–445 ocius incubuere *omnes* pariterque laborem *sortiti*. Doubt arises here, too, since *sortiti* may be a finite verb, though C. takes it as a participle[731] combined with *omnes*[732].

c. MEMBER EXPRESSING STATE A PAST PARTICIPLE; MEMBER EXPRESSING ACTION A PRESENT PARTICIPLE

Likewise the present participle may be combined with a past participle[733]—a true past participle (unlike the deponents just cited), denoting not so much a process in past time, as the result in present time of a past process[734], hence a state or condition as compared with the action indicated by the present participle.

An example is G. 3.253–254 *obiecta* retardant flumina correptosque unda *torquentia* montis. Jahn and Ladewig explain that there are two obstacles, the breadth of the rivers and their violence[735]; but C.

---

[729]See note 706.

[730]The ellipsis of this word, on which N. does not comment at all, seems to me harsh and hard to account for, especially as the verb immediately preceding it, *occurramus*, has a different subject. Still, there may be a reason for it: see note 652.

[731]It may, by the way, be a true past here rather than a virtual present, but that makes little or no difference.

[732]In this he says that he is following Wagner; but it is with the *adverb ocius*, not with the *adjective omnes*, that Wagner combines the participle (compare note 532). There is also a possibility that *-que* joins either *ocius* or *omnes* with the adverb *pariter*: in sense we may compare the first, and in form the second, with 11.673 *praecipites pariter*que ruunt, listed on 128. If we adopt this view, we must place a comma before *laborem* and probably stress the past sense of *sortiti*. However, the rhythm of the line, I think, would be against such grouping. The same factor would militate against still another possibility which might be recognized if *omnes* is coordinated with *pariter*, namely, that both these words are connected with *sortiti*, in which case the comma would have to be inserted not after *pariterque* but after *incubuere*. This last interpretation seems to me the weakest of all.

[733]Compare 31 and note 130.

[734]Compare note 716, on *inclusas* in 6.680.

[735]There certainly are two ideas present, but they are not perfectly parallel. (Compare the view as to the genesis of the so-called hendiadys summarized in note 3, and discussed in the article referred to in the same note.)

prefers to treat the two epithets as "not strictly co-ordinate". The connective *-que* is actually omitted in one manuscript, and, if we may judge from C's. note, by various editors[736].

Again in 8.640–641 *armati* . . . paterasque *tenentes* stabant, *-que* is certainly unnecessary; yet perhaps its inclusion makes the passage more picturesque.

11.100–101 oratores aderant . . . *velati* ramis oleae veniamque *rogantes* is fairly similar to the foregoing instance: *velati* corresponds perfectly to *armati*; but *rogantes*, inasmuch as it expresses a more definite action than the rather neutral *tenentes*, forms an even less perfect parallel for *velati* than does *tenentes* for *armati*, and therefore seems even less appropriately joined therewith by *-que*. However, the presence of the conjunction seems justified here by sense if not by grammar, since *velati ramis oleae* may be thought of as giving the suitable insignia of the suppliant envoys, and *veniam . . . rogantes* their natural action.

Still another example is 10.794–795 ille pedem *referens* et inutilis *in*que *ligatus* cedebat[737].

5. CAUSAL AND RESULTANT

a. PROCESS AND RESULT

As has already been said (173), the past participle in the examples just given indicates a result rather than a process. Sometimes, however, a past participle is more truly felt as indicating a process, and it may then be used in combination with some other term, an adjective or even a noun, which denotes the result produced or caused by this process. By a rather odd use of '*hysteron proteron*', it is the result which precedes in the examples of this type that I have noted[738].

An instance in which a noun is made parallel to a participle[739] is 6.448–449 iuvenis quondam, nunc *femina*, Caeneus, rursus et[740] in veterem fato *revoluta* figuram. It seems most natural to take *et* as connecting *femina* and *revoluta*, as I have indicated; but it might

[736]Then we should have a combination somewhat like that of *tristis . . . lacrimans* in G. 4.355–356. See note 718.

[737]Note the adjective *inutilis* united with the two participles. Compare 172–173.

[738]Perhaps Vergil feels that the result is the all-important thing. Compare what is said on 183–184 of G. 3.459–460 and G. 3.154–156.

[739]Compare 7.181–182 (115) and the four passages quoted on 168.

[740]Here *et* seems quite unnecessary for the sense (compare 173–174 on G. 3.253–254, and note 735). Metrically, as the passage runs at present, it is indispensable. But on the weight of an argument of this type, see 4.

join *rursus* with *in veterem. . .figuram*[741], or might be merely intensive. It is hard to judge, for the whole sentence is marked by a certain confusion which, as C. says, may well be deliberate[742].

An adjective is made parallel to a participle in 9.542–544 *semineces . . . confixi*que suis telis et pectora duro *transfossi* ligno veniunt. Here, however, *-que* may be correlative with the following *et*[743], the meaning being that all—both those who are pierced with their own weapons and those who are transfixed by the broken wood from the tower—fall in a dying condition; but this interpretation seems harsh.

b. CAUSE AND EFFECT

(1) Examples Involving Adjectives and Participles

We find other combinations of adjectives and participles in which the relationship involved is that of cause and effect rather than that of process and result. The present participle probably shows the cause of the state denoted by the adjective with which it is coordinated in 5.380 *alacris* cunctosque *putans* excedere palma[744], and so does the past participle in 11.159 *felix* morte tua neque in hunc *servata* dolorem[745]. With the latter example we may perhaps compare 1.475 *infelix* puer atque impar *congressus* Achilli[746]: K. says that the second member there is in causal relation with the first. But there is this difference: other factors beside that mentioned may go to produce the infelicity of Troilus, in other words one may, as I have done, view *infelix* as a *permanent* attribute; whereas in 11.159 the felicity of Evander's wife consists only in the one point specifically mentioned, as is indicated both by the immediate modifier of *felix*, *morte tua*, and by the context.

In 7.59–60 laurus. . .*sacra* comam multosque metu *servata* per annos, it is the adjective that indicates the cause, the participle that indicates the result.

In 5.608 multa *movens* necdum antiquum *saturata* dolorem[747], the past participle *saturata*[748] plays the part of cause, the present participle *movens* that of effect.

---

[741]Compare G. 3.212–213 (127). [742]Compare note 485.

[743]Compare notes 579 and 580. [744]Already discussed above, 172 and note 728.

[745]The participle here really repeats the ablative of cause (or possibly specification) which is associated with *felix*, and with which logically it should be combined. Thus we may say that there is a fusion here of *felix, namque mortua (es) neque servata (es)* and *felix morte tua et quod non servata es.* The latter expression also presents a lack of parallelism, but this time in the grammatical instead of in the logical sphere: compare above, 98–99, especially on G. 1.287–288 and 2.34.

[746]See above, 166 and note 704. [747]On this see again below, 184.

[748]For the negative past participle, compare *neque. . .servata* in 11.159 (quoted just above). But *saturata* is much more truly past in its force, with relation to its

(2) Examples Involving Verbs

Comparable to the combination of two participles is that of two finite verbs[749] in G. 3.417 vipera *delituit* caelumque . . . *fugit*, where the relation of *fugit* to *delituit* is undoubtedly causal[750], and in 7.50–51 *filius* huic . . . *proles*que *virilis nulla fuit*, primaque oriens *erepta* iuventa *est*[751], where the relation of the second clause to the first is again causal.

(3) Examples Involving Nouns

By far the commonest type of cause-effect combination is that consisting of two nouns.

A typical example is 1.504 instans *operi regnis*que futuris, already cited above (142)[752]. I am not quite sure whether I may list with this passage here, as I did there, G. 2.155 adde tot egregias *urbes* operumque *laborem*. The quotation from the Georgics does not belong here if *laborem* means, as I think it does, not 'work' but 'the result of work'[753].

We may note further 7.455 *bella* . . . *letum*que gero, 11.348 licet *arma* mihi *mortem*que minetur, 9.748 neque . . . is *teli* nec *vulneris* auctor[754], 9.479–480 non illa *pericli*[755] *telorum*que memor[756], 2.412 armorum *facie* et Graiarum *errore* iubarum[757].

---

coordinate, than is *servata*. The use of *necdum*, not the simple *neque*, tends to emphasize this.

[749]See note 604.

[750]It is equivalent to *fugiens*. We might instead, adopting an alternative choice as in 10.882–884 (on which see note 244), have reduced *delituit*, not *fugit*, to a participle, explaining not that *fugit* gives the cause of *delituit*, but that *delituit* gives the means of *fugit*; but the march of the thought demands that *delituit*, not *fugit*, be the main verb.

[751]On this see again below, 184.

[752]It will be noted that a particularly large number of the examples cited here (174–184) have already been listed elsewhere. Compare 178, 179, 182, notes 744, 746, 754, 756, 767, 768, 772, 777, 787, 794, 797; and, on the overlapping of categories in general, see note 592.

[753]The latter is certainly the signification of *labores* in G. 1.325–326 pluvia ingenti *sata* laeta boumque *labores* diluit, and in 2.306 sternit *sata* laeta boumque *labores*. For the metonymy compare the examples listed above, 154–157.

[754]Already cited above, 159. It may be noted that of the two objective genitives here, the first corresponds to an accusative of 'Affekt', and the second to an accusative of 'Effekt'. Compare note 760.

[755]To be sure, *pericli* here may stand for any danger whatsoever, not only for the specific peril caused by the weapons. Compare below, 185–188.

[756]Compare also 11.801–802 nihil ipsa nec aurae nec *sonitus* memor aut venientis. . .*teli*, for which see below, 177 and note 765. Similar, too, are 5.334 non tamen *Euryali*, non ille oblitus *amorum* (already cited, 159), and G. 3.498 labitur infelix, *studiorum* atque immemor *herbae* (already cited, 161). It might be possible to say of these that the source if not quite the cause of the two emotions, *amorum* and *studiorum*, is indicated by their two parallels, *Euryali* and *herbae* respectively. This, however, seems doubtful. See below, 178.

[757]On this rather complicated passage, see further below, 199.

One member may actually be made from, or out of, the other, as in 1.210 se *praedae* accingunt *dapibus*que futuris[758], E. 8.95–96 has *herbas* atque haec Ponto mihi lecta *venena* ipse dedit, G. 4.39–40 *fuco*que et *floribus* oras explent[759], 11.64–65 *cratis* et molle *feretrum* arbuteis texunt virgis[760].

An object may be coordinated (1) with the shadow that it casts, as in 10.190 populeas inter *frondes umbram*que sororum, perhaps 12.207 numquam fronde levi fundet *virgulta* nec *umbras*[761], possibly 1.693–694 amaracus illum *floribus* et dulci aspirans complectitur *umbra*[762], G. 3.418 *tecto* adsuetus coluber succedere et *umbrae*, 6.734 clausae *tenebris* et *carcere* caeco; (2) with the light that emanates from it, as in 2.470 *telis* et *luce* coruscus aëna, and 4.167 fulsere *ignes* et . . . *aether*[763]; (3) with the sound[764] that it produces, as in G. 4.151 Curetum *sonitus* crepitantiaque *aera* secutae, 11.801–802 nihil ipsa nec aurae nec *sonitus* memor aut venientis . . . *teli*[765], 12.869 *stridorem* agnovit et *alas*[766], 5.152 *turbam* inter *fremitum*que.

[758]Compare 1.504 instans *operi regnis*que futuris, cited above, 176.

[759]We may class this instance here whether we consider *fuco* a gum or paste from flowers, as P. does, or pollen, as C. does. Haverfield, dismissing C's. view as unlikely, tells us that the substance here described is propolis or bee-glue, and is not derived from flowers at all. Vergil, however, certainly appears to associate it with flowers; and it is assuredly our business to interpret Vergil's lines as he seems to mean them, whether it is the poet who is wrong in his science, or the commentator who is wrong in his understanding.

[760]Here *cratis* is an accusative of 'Affekt', *feretrum* an accusative of 'Effekt'. Compare notes 754, 773, 780, 795.

[761]I am not quite sure whether the shadows are supposed to be cast by the scepter itself, or by the *virgulta*. So far as general meaning goes, the two possibilities amount to practically the same thing; but the question whether the passage belongs here or not depends on which possibility we accept.

[762]On the possibility—remote, however—of combining *floribus* and *umbra* here, see 119–120 and note 483.

[763]The *aether* in a sense produces the *ignes*. It flashes by means of the *ignes*, not directly as the *ignes* do. On this see below, 182.

[764]Compare also G. 4.525–526 and 3.457, cited below, 183.

[765]I believe that *teli* indicates the source of the sound denoted by *sonitus*. I should take *aurae* as C. does, of the wind of the weapon. However, this word, rather than *teli*, is associated with *sonitus* by N., who, in his note on 12.869, calls *nec aurae nec sonitus* equal to *aurae sonantis*, and ignores *teli* altogether. If he is right in associating *aurae* and *sonitus* so closely, we should probably have to say that *aurae* and *teli* here have much the same relationship as *aether* and *ignes* in 4.167, cited just above: see 177 and note 763, also 182. 11.863–864 teli *stridorem aura*sque sonantis audiit una Arruns is of no use as a parallel, since there two separate sounds are involved, that of the weapon as it leaves the bow, and that of the weapon as it whizzes through the air. The former is indicated by *teli stridorem*, the latter by *auras . . . sonantis*, which certainly stands for *aurarum sonitum* (on this see below, 218). The use of *una* (864) need cause no trouble: this word probably means that, though there are two sounds, Arruns hears them as one, because of the rapidity of the arrow's flight. It might also be possible that *una* refers to the previous sentence (though it would then perhaps be tautological with *extemplo*, line 863), or to the following clause, *haesitque in corpore ferrum*—Arruns no sooner hears the weapon than he feels it within his body.

[766]Compare 12. 876–877 alarum *verbera* nosco letalemque *sonum*, where the verbal expression *alarum verbera* corresponds to the concrete *alas* of 12.869.

Sometimes a sound or other manifestation is combined not with the physical agency that produces it but with the emotion that is its cause or source, as in a group of combinations already cited (171–172) in another connection[767]: 5.148–149 *plausu fremitu*que virum *studiis*que faventum consonat omne nemus, 8.717 *laetitia* ludisque viae *plausu*que fremebant, 2.413–414 *gemitu* atque . . . *ira* . . . invadunt, 7.15 exaudiri *gemitus irae*que leonum, 8.60–61 *iram*que *minas*que . . . supera, 11.122–123 *odiis* et *crimine* Drances infensus. To this group we may add here 11.736 non in *Venerem* segnes nocturnaque *bella*, since the passion denoted by *Venerem* produces the activities denoted by *bella*.

In other passages the emotion is not a cause but a result—the result of some other agency. Here again we may note a group of examples already listed under another category (159): 1.636 *munera laetitiam*que dii, 10.755–756 aequabat *luctus* et mutua Mavors *funera*, 4.693–694 longum miserata *dolorem* difficilisque *obitus*, G. 2.491–492 *metus* omnis et inexorabile *fatum* subiecit pedibus *strepitum*que Acherontis, G. 3.226 gemens *ignominiam plagas*que, 7.552 *terrorum* et *fraudis* abunde est.

It might be possible to add to these passages two others[768], 5.334 non tamen Euryali, non[769] ille oblitus *amorum*, and G. 3.498 *studiorum* atque immemor *herbae*, whereof it might be said that the emotions indicated have at once their source and their object in the terms made parallel with them. But in the first passage, by metonymy[770] *amorum* may itself represent the source or object of love, that is, the beloved, as C. suggests. And in the second, *studiorum* doubtless has a much wider application than *herbae* alone[771].

We may certainly note here two other passages, in which the external source is treated as practically identical with the intangible

---

Perhaps we may note here also 8.531 agnovit *sonitum* et divae *promissa* parentis. The promises, while they do not actually produce the sound involved here, as do the wings in 12.869, and the beating of the wings in 12.876–877, still are manifested in the sound, and are recognized through it—or at least their fulfilment is. See on this further below, 181.

[767]Compare note 752.

[768]Already grouped together in note 756; also treated separately, on 159 and 161, respectively.

[769]'Connective repetition'. Compare note 46.

[770]Compare note 753.

[771]It is for this reason that the passage is classed above (161) under the head "Miscellaneous Examples", in a group in which there is no internal relationship between the subjective and objective terms; not under the earlier division (157–160), "One Member the Cause of the Other".

inner result that it produces[772]. These are 6.715 securos *latices* et longa *oblivia* potant, and G. 1.86–87 occultas *viris* et *pabula* terrae pinguia concipiunt. In drinking the waters, they drink oblivion; in partaking of the food, they partake of strength.

On the other hand, the cause may come from within, and the resultant reaction be external. Pairs illustrating this combination, too, have already been given (157–159), but once more a recapitulation may not be amiss. The examples noted are as follows: G. 2.174–175 res antiquae *laudis* et *artis* ingredior; 8.287–288 carmine *laudes* Herculeas et *facta* ferunt[773]; 11.444 est *virtus* et *gloria*; 5.343–344 tutatur *favor* Euryalum *lacrimae*que decorae . . . et . . . *virtus*; 11.539 pulsus ob *invidiam* regno *viris*que superbas.

c. PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CAUSE OR MEANS

(1) Examples Involving Nouns

In the last example just given, 11.539, since *viris* indicates the direct cause of *invidiam*, and *invidiam* in its turn the direct cause of the action denoted by the participle *pulsus*, *viris* may be said to denote the indirect cause of this action. We find a number of passages in which two terms, while not quite in the relation to each other of cause and effect as *viris* and *invidiam* are, still in some manner resemble this pair in that one of them acts upon or through the other; that is, with relation to the action produced, one term serves as a direct or immediate, and the other as an indirect or fundamental, cause or means.

This is particularly natural when one term indicates a divine and the other a human agency. Thus in 2.336–337 talibus Othryadae *dictis* et *numine* divum . . . feror, we may say with C. that in Panthus's words is declared the will of heaven. We have the same sort of collocation[774] immediately thereafter, in 2.337–338 quo tristis *Erinys*, quo[775] *fremitus* vocat et sublatus ad aethera *clamor*. Other

[772]We thus find a combination of the metaphorical and the literal as well as of the subjective and the objective. Compare 154, also note 752. A possible parallel for 6.715, but without the combination of literal and metaphorical elements, is 9.604 *gelu* duramus et *undis*, already discussed (147 and note 617).

[773]Here *laudes* may be accusative of 'Effekt' and *facta* of 'Affekt'. Compare note 760.

[774]For the connection of ideas, we may compare further 2.34 sive *dolo* seu iam Troiae sic *fata* ferebant; 2.54 si *fata* deum, si *mens* non laeva fuisset; and a passage that is verbally an even closer parallel, 1.446–447 templum. . . *donis* opulentum et *numine* divae, for which see above, 160. Compare, too, 3.337 sed tibi qui cursum *venti*, quae *fata* dedere?, and the reminiscence of this in Valerius Flaccus 8.174 te *venti* procul et tua *fata* ferebant. On this tendency of Vergil's to place the natural and the supernatural in juxtaposition, see Robert Seymour Conway, Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age, 100–102 (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1928).

[775]Compare note 769.

similar passages are 11.233 admonet *ira* deum *tumuli*que . . . recentes, in which the gods' wrath is manifested in the need of *tumuli*, and 7.769 revocatum *herbis* et *amore* Dianae[776], in which Diana's love sets the herbs at work. With these passages in which the first or fundamental cause or means, which is divine, sets working a secondary cause or means, which is human, we may compare an instance, already noted[777], in which the first result achieved, which is divine, sets working, or brings about, a more remote result[778], which pertains to the world of man[779]. This is 1.78–79 tu *sceptra Iovem*que concilias[780], which, as has been said above (159), means that Jupiter is won over, so that the scepter is won[781].

The mere arrival of a god may constitute, or at least lead to, aid[782], as in 8.200–201 attulit . . . aetas *auxilium adventum*que dei[783].

---

[776]Compare with this Ovid, Metamorphoses 4.148–149 tua te *manus* . . . *amor*que perdidit. Here the combination of the concrete noun, literally used, and the abstract noun, figuratively used, is very striking. Compare the examples cited above, 144–150. If *amor* is thought of as the victim's own emotion, we may compare also the quaint coupling of corporeal and incorporeal attributes noted on 150–152, for instance the combination of *vox* and *manus* in 3.177 and 10.667 (151). On the other hand, if *amor* is viewed, in accordance with a common ancient conception, rather as a sort of objective supernatural agency, possibly even a god, working upon the victim from without, we may compare instead the combinations of internal and external entities listed on 152–154. Note especially 4.517–519 and 10.619–620 (153). These two examples resemble the one from Ovid likewise in that they, too, may be regarded as a combination of direct and indirect means; and for this reason they are cited again just below, 182. If the passages are viewed from this angle, one difference must be noted: in the two from Vergil, *manibus* and *manu* indicate the *indirect* means, whereas in the one from Ovid, *manus* indicates the *direct* means.

[777]See 159 and note 671.

[778]There is no fundamental difference between a pair of examples involving direct and indirect cause or means and a pair of examples involving direct and indirect result: it is largely a matter of syntax. In the first four passages given, the pairs of words involved are all either in the nominative as subject of active verbs, or in the ablative as indicating means with passive verbs, and thus denote the agency or instrumentality acting upon the verbs. In the final example, the pair of words are in the accusative as direct object, and thus of course indicate the object or result of the action expressed by the verbs. But the mutual relationship of the two members making up the pair remains unaltered: one acts on, or through, the other. For another group of objects in which the action directed toward the second leads to the action directed toward the first, we may perhaps note 2.258–259 *Danaos* et . . . laxat *claustra*: the opening of the bars makes possible the freeing of the Greeks.

[779]Or at least of lesser gods. The speaker, Aeolus, in his relation to Jupiter, occupies much the same position as a mere human being. Note Sainte-Beuve's interesting comment, in Étude sur Virgile, 207 (Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1891): "Il y a en lui du centurion ou du tribun des soldats anobli, divinisé."

[780]*Iovem* is distinctly an accusative of 'Affekt'; *sceptra* is more like an accusative of 'Effekt'. Compare note 760.

[781]Compare the zeugma in 2.258–259, cited just above, note 778.

[782]We can compare with this the semantic development of such a verb as *adsum*, or the hailing of a deity as "a very *present* help in trouble" (Psalms 46.1).

[783]To be sure, the god (Hercules), after he came, rendered distinct and definite aid; but, unless we are to recognize an instance of '*hysteron proteron*' here, it

As the god's arrival brings aid in the previous example, so does the good fortune of the weapon make a way for it in 10.421–422 da . . . ferro . . . *fortunam* atque *viam*.

In 3.256–257 vos dira *fames* nostraeque *iniuria* caedis ambesas subigat malis absumere mensas, the direct cause of the Trojans' suffering is the *fames*, the fundamental or ultimate cause is the *iniuria* which caused the existence of the *fames*.

In G. 3.561–562 *morbo inluvie*que peresa vellera, the wool of the sheep is eaten away first by the actual taint of the disease in general[784], and secondly by the filth, the discharge from the sores, produced thereby.

In G. 2.378–379 illi nocuere *greges* durique *venenum*[785] dentis et admorsu signata in stirpe *cicatrix*, the goats work disaster through the poison administered in their bite, and through the wound produced thereby.

The accomplishment of one member of a pair may be manifested in the existence of the other. Thus in 5.53–54 annua *vota* tamen sollemnisque ordine *pompas* exsequerer[786], the following of the funeral procession by Aeneas constitutes the fulfilment of his vows. In 8.531 agnovit *sonitum* et divae *promissa* parentis (already referred to, note 766), Aeneas recognizes in the sound the fulfilment of his mother's promises.

One member may give an opportunity for the existence or for the practice of the second, as in 9.150–152 *tenebras* et inertia *furta* . . . ne timeant, 4.423 viri mollis *aditus* et *tempora* noras, 4.433 tempus inane peto, *requiem spatium*que furori.

Like the two previous examples are those in which one member indicates the period of time that introduces the advent of the other, or, as in the last instance given in this paragraph, in some way works upon the other. Examples are 8.326–327 deterior . . . ac decolor *aetas* et belli *rabies* et *amor* successit habendi, 12.150 Parcarumque

---

would seem that the assistance thought of for the moment is decidedly involved in his arrival. In any event, the two verbal nouns are not absolutely parallel.

[784]P's. translation of *morbo* by 'sores' seems scarcely accurate.

[785]Contrast with this E. 8.95 *herbas* atque. . .*venena* (cited above, 177). The venom mentioned there is actually made out of the herbs, whereas here it is simply used by the herds. These two passages show clearly the difference between what I mean by 'cause and effect' and what I mean by 'direct and indirect, or primary and secondary, cause or means'.

[786]Compare the similar use of *seguor* in a double sense, literal with the concrete object and metaphorical with the abstract one, in 4.537–538 Iliacas. . . *classis* atque ultima Teucrum *iussa* sequar? (cited again below, note 1009, in a different connection).

dies et *vis* inimica propinquat, 10.504–505 *spolia* . . . *diem*que oderit[787], 4.679 idem ambas ferro *dolor* atque eadem *hora* tulisset, E. 9.40–41 hic *ver* purpureum, varios hic[788] flumina circum fundit *humus* flores. In the last two examples, the lack of perfect parallelism between the paired nouns is revealed by the fact that they do not bear quite the same relationship to their common verb. This latter circumstance in its turn is made clear by a shift to the passive. If such a shift is made, in 4.679 *hora* will probably become an ablative of time, *dolor* an ablative of cause or of means[789]; and in E. 9.40–41 *ver* will probably become an ablative of time or of agent, *humus* an ablative of means. In the latter passage, if we personify *ver* by making it an ablative of agent, we are stressing the figurative element of the passage; but this element is present in any case. Only in a metaphorical sense does the spring pour forth flowers; it does so *indirectly*, through the instrumentality of the land. The land *actually* pours forth the flowers, as a result of the influence of the spring.

Much the same part as is played in the realm of time by the five foregoing examples is played in the realm of space by 4.167 fulsere *ignes* et . . . *aether*[790]. The lightning does its flashing directly; the ether does its flashing indirectly[791], through the lightning.

In 6.230 spargens *rore* levi et *ramo* felicis olivae, the sprinkling is done with the dew, but the branch is the instrument by which this sprinkling is applied. With 6.230 we may perhaps compare 4.517–519 ipsa *mola manibus*que piis . . . testatur . . . deos, and 10.619–620 tua larga saepe *manu* multisque oneravit limina *donis* (see the discussion of these two passages above, 153). Then *manibus* and *manu* correspond to *ramo*, *mola* and *donis* to *rore*. As the hand may be coordinated with the meal or the gifts that it scatters, so it is coordinated with the weapon that it throws or thrusts, in 6.57 Paridis

---

[787]Already cited, note 644. This passage furnishes a good example of the collocation of abstract and concrete. Compare note 776.

[788]Compare note 769.

[789]Of means if C. is right in combining *dolor* very closely with *ferro*, which he takes as almost equal to *ferri*. In accordance with this view, he places a comma after *dolor*. The word-order would seem to support his opinion, the rhythm to oppose it.

[790]Already cited, 177. See also note 763.

[791]Just as a house is said to 'shriek with the cries of women' (2.487–488 plangoribus aedes femineis ululant), though it is really the women who do the shrieking (compare 4.168 summoque ululārunt vertice Nymphae). A verb employed in this way I like to think of as a 'transferred verb', since it comes very close in the manner of its use to a 'transferred epithet' (compare K.[2] on 2.488). It is not common to combine with a single verb the normal force and the 'transferred' force, as Vergil does in 4.167.

derexti *tela manus*que. With this passage we may compare 12.624 *currum*que et *equos* et *lora* regebat: the management of the horses, and consequently of the car also, is accomplished by means of the reins.

With that which is guided may be coordinated not only a material guiding agency such as reins or hands, but also, by a greater inconcinnity[792], some abstract motive-power, such as bodily strength, as in 5.684 nec *vires* heroum infusaque *flumina* prosunt, or mental courage, as in 5.640 deus ipse *faces animum*que ministrat.

We find also the reverse combination, that of a concrete cause (a physical organ) and an abstract result (a mere sound[793]), in two passages[794], G. 4.525–526 *vox* ipsa et frigida *lingua* . . . vocabat, and 3.457 *vocem*que . . . atque *ora* resolvat[795].

(2) Examples Involving Verbs[796]

Comparable to the combination of abstract and concrete terms in the examples of the two previous paragraphs is that of literal and metaphorical expressions in 6.542–543 laeva ⟨via⟩ malorum *exercet poenas* et *ad impia Tartara mittit*[797]. Here the literal phrase gives the means of the figurative one, according to the paraphrase offered by K., "sets in train, puts in motion . . . by sending them".

We find other examples of pairs of verbs one of which indicates means with respect to the other. One is G. 3.459–460 profuit incensos

---

[792]Compare the examples cited on pages 150–152; also 11.233 and 7.769, listed on page 180, and further commented on in note 776. For the reverse state of affairs, where, in a combination of abstract and concrete, it is the latter instead of the former that designates the motive-power or first cause, compare 6.715 and G. 1.86–87 (on these see page 179 and note 772).

[793]We may compare the examples cited above, 177, of combinations of objects and the sounds produced by them.

[794]Both discussed above, 151 and note 629.

[795]This example is rather reminiscent of 2.258–259 (cited in note 778) *Danaos* et . . . laxat *claustra*, *vocem* corresponding to *Danaos*, and *ora* to *claustra*. We may compare the remarkably similar English example found in The Story of My Life, by Helen Keller, 59 (New York, Doubleday, Page and Company, 1910), "I persisted in using my *lips* and *voice*". Since the voice can scarcely be said to exist independent of its use, we may probably call *voice* and *vocem* accusatives of 'Effekt', while *lips* and *ora* are of course accusatives of 'Affekt'. Compare note 760.

[796]See note 604.

[797]Above (144) both these expressions were treated as figurative in contradistinction to the contrasted clause, *dextera <via> quae Ditis magni sub moenia tendit*. To say that a road 'stretches toward the walls' is obviously to use far more literal language than to say that it 'administers punishments' or that it 'sends (the guilty) to Tartarus', since *both* these last statements involve personification. But when we come to compare these two statements with each other, regardless of the first one, we see that they are by no means on a par: a road may much more readily be said to 'send' persons than to 'punish' them, and the figure involved in the latter expression is far bolder than that involved in the former.

aestus *avertere* et . . . *ferire* . . . venam, which C. explains by *avertere feriendo*. The action indicated by *avertere* is attained as a result of that indicated by *ferire*, but is put first[798] because getting rid of the fever is the first thing to be thought of, while the method, as less important, is added afterwards in an epexegetical manner. In the same way in G. 3.154–156 hunc ⟨asilum⟩ . . . (nam mediis fervoribus acrior instat) *arcebis* gravido pecori, armentaque *pasces* sole recens orto aut noctem ducentibus astris, the main thing is to keep the gadfly away from the cattle. After giving this warning, Vergil adds the way the farmer may accomplish this, namely by feeding them in the morning or the evening, for the heat is particularly intense at noon[799].

In 3.448–449 verso tenuis cum cardine *ventus impulit* et teneras *turbavit ianua* frondes, the disturbing of the leaves is caused only indirectly by the door (i. e., by its opening), which renders possible the direct cause thereof, the entrance of the wind. "The door," as C. puts it, "is said to do what the wind does when the door is opened."

With the foregoing we may perhaps compare 7.21–23 quae ne *monstra* pii *paterentur* talia Troes delati in portus neu *litora* dira *subirent*, Neptunus ventis implevit vela secundis, in which we find mention of end secured instead of means employed[800]. The enduring of the monsters is only indirectly prevented by the filling of the sails, which renders possible the direct preventive thereof, the avoidance of the dangerous shores[801].

We may note here again 7.50–51 *filius* huic fato divum *proles*que virilis nulla fuit, primaque oriens *erepta* iuventa est[802], regarding these verses with special reference to the verse that follows, 52 sola domum . . . servabat filia. The direct cause of this following verse is expressed by the words *filius* . . . *prolesque virilis nulla fuit*; and the direct cause of this fact, namely *prima* . . . *oriens erepta iuventa est*, thus becomes the indirect or fundamental cause of the following one. 5.608 multa movens necdum antiquum saturata dolorem[803] is similar. Here *movens*, which expresses a result with reference to *saturata*, at the same time tacitly implies a cause with reference to an earlier verse, 606 Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno, so that we once more have a combination of the direct and the indirect cause.

---

[798]See note 738.

[799]The *nam* clause really belongs with *pasces*, not with *arcebis*: but in treating the two clauses as coordinate, and thus as virtually equivalent, Vergil transfers the logical modifier of one to the other. We may compare the not altogether dissimilar misplacement of the *si* clause in G. 1.199–203 (see 44).

[800]Compare note 778. [801]See note 251. [802]Already cited on 176.

[803]Already cited on 175.

6. FIXED AND VAGUE

a. DEFINITE AND INDEFINITE

In 8.600–601 Silvano fama est veteres sacrasse Pelasgos . . . *lucum*que *diem*que, the two nouns do not seem quite parallel[804], since the one is used definitely, meaning *the* grove (just mentioned), the other indefinitely, meaning *a* day[805]—a particular day, to be sure, but still one whose place in the calendar is not specified.

b. SPECIFIC AND GENERAL

In 9.649–651 ibat Apollo omnia longaevo similis *vocem*que *colorem*que et *crinis albos* et *saeva* sonoribus *arma*, the third substantive (*crinis*) is more specific than the first or the second, thanks to the presence of a limiting adjective. The first two substantives, however, are not so much indefinite as general. There is certainly a fusion here of the simple statement that Apollo resembled the old man *vocemque coloremque et crinis*, and some other, more specific statement in which the character of the old man's voice and complexion would be indicated as well as that of his hair. The mention of the *arma*[806], too, is not quite coordinate with the rest, since, while in voice, complexion, and hair Apollo may well have resembled this specific individual, the old man Butes, it would seem that in arms he would be like all men in general. It might be held that there is a reference here to distinctive arms possessed by Butes[807], but this would not appear to be indicated by the very general modifier *saeva sonoribus*[808].

1.589–591 decoram *caesariem* nato genetrix *lumen*que iuventae purpureum et laetos oculis adflarat *honores* is more or less on the same order. The expression *decoram caesariem* is more concrete, more specific; it refers to the particular hair of the particular person in

---

[804]There is, moreover, another difference (compare note 592): *diem* is abstract; *lucum* is concrete. This distinction exists also in the somewhat similar passage 6.69–70 *templum* instituam festosque *dies*.

[805]Compare 9.91 (188), where we might translate by '*the* voyage and *a* storm'. In a language possessing articles, the distinction would be more marked.

[806]Moreover, the accusative of specification, while quite natural with the parts of the body enumerated, seems a little odd with *arma*.

[807]This, to be sure, is possible. Compare 2.391–393 comantem Androgeo galeam clipeique insigne decorum induitur laterique Argivum accommodat ensem.

[808]There is nothing at all distinctive about *saeva* as there is about *albos*. The adjective *saeva* is often used of arms: compare 1.294–295 Furor. . . *saeva* sedens super *arma*, 8.482 *saevis* tenuit Mezentius *armis*, 12.890 non cursu, *saevis* certandum est comminus *armis*, 11.545 *tela* undique *saeva* premebant. The adjective in 9.651 seems little more than a stock epithet (8.482 is probably, and 12.890 is possibly, different; on these see note 620).

question[809]. The expressions *lumen. . .iuventae purpureum* and *laetos . . .honores* are more abstract, more general; they refer to a general ideal supply on which Venus levies to bestow a part thereof upon her son. A better balanced and more logical, though undoubtedly vastly less poetic, sentence would be *decus caesariei nati*[810] *genetrix lumenque iuventae purpureum ⟨toti formae⟩ et laetos oculis adflarat*[811] *honores.*

A like fusion between a more abstract, general idea and a more concrete, specific one occurs in 12.206–211 "...sceptrum hoc"—dextra sceptrum nam forte gerebat—"numquam...fundet virgulta nec umbras, . . . olim arbos, nunc artificis manus aere decoro *inclusit* patribusque *dedit* gestare Latinis"[812]. Here the words *nunc . . . inclusit* refer to the manufacture from a particular shoot[813] of the particular scepter which King Latinus held in his hand, while *patribus . . . Latinis*[814] refers to that more abstract or ideal scepter[815] which it was the right of all the *patres Latini*[816] to bear. The only alternative

[809]It is also rather illogical; Aeneas already had the *hair*; his mother merely made it beautiful. Some such verb as *reddiderat* would be more in order. C. calls the use of *adflarat* with *caesariem* a zeugma.

[810]A genitive instead of the dative of reference *nato* to avoid the awkward concurrence of two datives (compare note 219). Another possible way to avoid such awkwardness would be to place *nato* first in the sentence.

[811]More accurate though less poetic than *adflarat* would be *addiderat*.

[812]Compare note 604.

[813]There is an additional anomaly in that the *scepter* is likewise confused with the *shoot*, since grammatically it is the word *sceptrum*, but logically it is the growing shoot, that serves as subject of the words (208–209) cum semel in silvis imo de stirpe recisum matre caret posuitque comas et bracchia ferro.

[814]Incidentally we may note in passing that *manus*, which must be taken as the subject of both verbs, *inclusit* and *dedit*, logically belongs only in the first clause, not in the second.

[815]This union of an idea that is true only of one particular object, and one that is applicable to all members of the class to which the object belongs, is comparable to the union of an epithet that is true for the moment and one that is always true. Compare 161–171.

[816]All that is said here is said on the assumption that *patribus* = 'senators', or, at least, the members of some primitive group of elders that constituted the forerunner of the Roman senate, which Vergil, of course, would be most eager to connect with its primeval prototype. (Compare, for instance, 5.341, where *patrum* = merely the Trojan fathers in general, but is assuredly meant to suggest to us, as the editors remind us, the Roman senators in the front seats assigned to them by a law of later days.) But if *patribus* in this passage has not this signification, but is used as a synonym of *regibus*, the use of *sceptrum* is perfectly logical: one special scepter is really meant, a scepter which, ever since it left the hands of the artist that fashioned it, has been handed down through the royal line of Latium, from father to son. This interpretation would also settle the difficulty suggested by N., who says that here Vergil "represents the Latin 'patres' or primitive senate as occasionally carrying the sceptre, though generally it is the symbol of royalty alone". Of course in this sense there is just one *pater* to a generation: Latinus is *pater Latinus* par excellence (compare 7.61–62, 11.469), as Anchises is *pater Anchises*, and after him his son is *pater Aeneas*—a suggestion of the paternal relation in which the king or high priest or chieftain stands to all his people (this relation survived the kings, so that the emperor became *pater Romanus*, 9.449). However, it is doubtful whether Vergil uses the word *patres* as a synonym for

to this view would be the thoroughly bizarre notion that there was only *one* scepter, which was shared by Latinus with all the *patres* and passed about among them, and which Latinus at that moment happened to be holding. In that event we must stress *forte* (206). Otherwise, indeed, this word may seem weak, as it does to N.; but none the less it is quite easily accounted for, by such parallels as those that N. himself cites, 11.552 telum . . . quod forte gerebat and 12.488–489 forte gerebat . . . hastilia[817].

In 1.360 *fugam* Dido *socios*que parabat[818], the action of procuring or equipping comrades—particular men whom on this particular occasion she procured or equipped as comrades—seems more specific than that of planning or preparing for flight.

---

reges. Wherever the plural occurs in a sense other than its primary one of 'fathers' or 'forefathers', it seems to refer to some sort of group of elders or senators. Thus in G. 2.509 plebisque patrumque, 4.682 populumque patresque, 8.679 cum patribus populoque, 9.192 populusque patresque, the *patres* are definitely contrasted with the common people (of Rome, Carthage, Rome again, and Troy, respectively), so that, in each instance, the phrase gives a decided suggestion of the stereotyped *senatus populusque Romanus*. The Roman senate of Vergil's own day is introduced, just before the consul, in 7.611; and there can be no doubt that the primitive senate called by Acestes is meant in 5.758, and that the one meeting under Latinus is referred to in 7.176 and 11.379. I find only one possible parallel for *patribus Latinis* in the sense of *regibus Latinis*, namely, 1.7, where *Albani. . . patres* might, it seems to me, easily be taken as a synonym for *Albani reges*. We may compare the succession of these monarchs, all the direct descendants of Aeneas through Ascanius, that Livy outlines in 1.3.6–11; and we may also recall the tradition, reported by Servius on E. 6.3, that Vergil himself intended to recount the exploits of these *reges*. However, the editors do not so take *Albani. . . patres*. C. does not even raise the question of the possibility of such an interpretation, though he does mention—only to deny—the possibility that the phrase may mean "our Alban ancestors"; and it would seem that, in view of the reason he gives for it, his own explanation is the correct one, namely: "the senate, or rather the noble houses of Alba, of which the Julii were one".

[817]Compare also Ovid, Metamorphoses 10.649–650 hinc tria forte mea veniens decerpta ferebam aurea poma manu.

[818]Either *fugam parabat* or *socios parabat* alone is perfectly natural: C. offers a parallel for each. But the combination is a little odd (compare note 3 on zeugma). There is a distinction in the relationship that these two objects bear to the verb. The locution *fugam parabat* means simply 'she prepared flight'. The locution *socios parabat* might similarly mean simply 'she prepared comrades' in the sense that she secured comrades, in which case *socios* would closely resemble *fugam* in its relation to the verb (though an inconcinnity between the two would still exist, since in the first place *fugam* is abstract and *socios* concrete, and in the second place *fugam* is not only more intangible but also more indefinite than *socios*). However, I do not think that is the meaning of the phrase. I think it signifies not so much that she secured comrades as that she secured these special men to be her comrades. We may compare the use of *comites* in the parallel cited by C., 2.181 arma deosque parant comites. The distinction between the two objects, *fugam* and *socios*, is then rather like that observed as existing between the two objects, *iura* and *magistratus*, in 1.426 (note 613). Still another possibility is that the phrase means that she equipped her comrades (after she had secured them). Then the discrepancy between the two objects is still greater, for, while *fugam* is in any case an accusative of 'Effekt', *socios* must according to this view be taken as an accusative of 'Affekt' (compare note 760); and we must recognize a zeugma as well.

In 9.91–92 ne *cursu* quassatae ullo neu *turbine*[819] venti vincantur[820], we find *cursu*, which refers to the entire voyage in general, paired with *turbine*, which refers to a specific incident occurring in the course of the voyage[821].

c. ACTUAL AND CONTINGENT

There is also another distinction between *cursu* and *turbine* in the example just cited. The *cursus* is to come inevitably, and may or may not be dangerous; the *turbo* will certainly be dangerous if it comes, but it may or may not come.

Other combinations of the actual and the probable are 7.455 *bella . . . letum*que gero, 11.348 licet *arma* mihi *mortem*que minetur, 9.204 *Aenean* et *fata* extrema secutus. In each case the attainment of the first objective *may* involve[822] that of the second, but does not inevitably do so.

A somewhat more complicated[823] instance of the same type is seen in 2.562–563 subiit *deserta Creusa* et *direpta domus* et parvi *casus* Iuli. Creusa is certainly *deserta*, but Aeneas cannot be sure that his home is *direpta* (as a matter of fact it is not). As for *casus Iuli*, it belongs in a class with *deserta Creusa* if *casus* here has its neutral sense of 'fortune', with *direpta domus* if it has its positive sense of 'misfortune'. Of course this very mingling of positive and possible truths as actualities all, is an excellent indication of the state of excited imagination, even of despair, under which Aeneas is laboring.

A still more complex passage, which involves successive clauses[824], or even sentences, is G. 3.498–508

> labitur infelix, studiorum atque immemor herbae,
> victor equus fontisque avertitur et pede terram
> crebra ferit; demissae aures, incertus ibidem
> sudor et ille quidem morituris frigidus; aret
> pellis et ad tactum tractanti dura resistit.
> haec ante exitium primis dant signa diebus.

[819]Note that, while *turbine* is certainly an ablative of means, *cursu* might be classified as an ablative of place. Compare 7–9.

[820]Already referred to in note 805.

[821]For the combination of part and whole, compare 242–244.

[822]Compare 176–183.

[823]We may note that here in two of the members it is a participle that carries the main idea, while in the third it is a noun. See below, 209–210, on this additional inconcinnity, which is of an altogether different type from the one under discussion in the present section.

[824]Compare note 604.

sin in processu coepit crudescere morbus,
tum vero ardentes oculi atque attractus ab alto
spiritus, interdum gemitu gravis, imaque longo
ilia singultu tendunt, it naribus ater
sanguis, et obsessas fauces premit aspera lingua.

P. sums up the difficulty here in the words: "After describing the symptoms 'in the early days *before death*' it is of course illogical to say 'but *if* the disease begins to grow violent' ". The only way out of this difficulty that I can see is to say that the first five lines sum up *signa* that are *probable*, and the last four, *signa* that are *positive*. The symptoms enumerated in 498–502 are sometimes, perhaps,merely warnings, but not necessarily sure proofs of death, although, according to 503, *if* death is to come, these appear first. But we are led tacitly to understand that the second set of danger-signals, listed in 505–508, are definite indications, occurring when—and only when—death is surely to come. This, to be sure, Vergil does not specifically state; he merely says that, if the disease grows worse, these symptoms occur, not that, if they occur, the disease is bound to grow worse; but if he does not mean this, there seems little or no point in the use of the contrasting *sin*. It is true that a much simpler explanation exists, that of Keightley, who regards *sin* as meaning 'but when', not 'but if'. C. accepts this, and compares *si* in 5.64–65 si nona diem mortalibus almum Aurora extulerit. But there the use of *si* instead of the more natural *cum* is probably due, as C. himself says *ad loc.*, to "a modest, perhaps religious way of speaking of a future event". Thus the employment in 5.64 of *si* almost in the sense of 'when' cannot justify the employment in G. 3.504 of *sin* absolutely in the sense of 'but when'. P., who also compares 5.64, does not go so far as C. He says of *sin* that it "almost = 'but when' ", and then goes on to express a view much like that advocated above, to wit that Vergil's phrase "just hints that, although the earlier symptoms, which he has described, generally end in graver ones and death, yet they do not necessarily do so".[825]

[825]In this connection it may be of interest to note a slight confusion of a rather different sort that occurs in another list of symptoms, this time in connection with bees—G. 4.253–259. Here, in the midst of sure signs of disease, Vergil mentions the removing of the corpses from the hive—an indication, to be sure, that disease is present, but certainly a sign of a different sort from the others enumerated. See the discussion of this passage, 79–80.

7. ANIMATE AND INANIMATE

a. PERSON OR PERSONS AND PLACE

(1) Word for Place a Common Noun

Quite a different type of combination is that of a word denoting a place with that of one denoting a person[826], as in 12.197–199 *terram, mare, sidera,* iuro Latonaeque *genus* duplex *Ianum*que bifrontem, *vim*que *deum* infernam et duri *sacraria* Ditis. Here *genus*[827] and, still more, *Ianum,* stand for the persons, as does also the periphrasis *vim . . . deum infernam* = (*potentes*) *deos infernos*[828]. On the other hand *sacraria Ditis* represents the place[829]. Finally *terram, mare, sidera* represent perhaps an intermediate stage. In a sense *terra* is herself a deity, and so are the stars[830]—compare *Latonae . . . genus duplex,* which, N. says, stands for the sun and the moon[831]. Yet in a sense these three entities, earth, sea, and stars, are places too: *mare* might be called *sacraria Neptuni* just as easily as the nether regions are called *sacraria Ditis*[832].

Other examples are 5.744 Pergameumque *Larem* et canae *penetralia* Vestae; 9.258–259 penatis Assaracique *Larem* et canae *penetralia*

---

[826]Compare further the examples cited below, 231–236.

[827]For *genus* used of a person, compare note 714.

[828]The example is listed again on page 206 as exemplifying a special type of periphrasis also. It is to be observed that the equivalent to the periphrasis offered here involves an undesirable piling up of epithets: compare note 932.

[829]For its combination with gods, we may perhaps compare 4.510–511 *Erebum*que *Chaos*que tergeminamque *Hecaten.* On this see 227.

[830]Compare 4.519–520 testatur. . . deos et conscia fati sidera, 9.429 caelum hoc et conscia sidera testor; also Juvenal 8.149–150 nocte quidem, sed Luna videt, sed sidera testes intendunt oculos.

[831]Compare the reverse phenomenon in G. 1.5–6, where Vergil hails the sun and moon—*clarissima mundi lumina*—in the same breath as Liber and Ceres (7), the Fauns and the Dryads (10–11). In this connection I may add that I do *not* agree with C's. view that the sun and the moon here are identified with Bacchus and Ceres. For an excellent and, to me at least, convincing discussion of this question, I refer to P. N., too, disagrees with C. He, however, according to Haverfield, considers *lumina* as including the stars as well as the sun and the moon. This I think highly doubtful. I believe the *clarissima lumina* are simply the two prominent bodies that are so important to the farmer, both for their influence, whether real or imaginary, on the crops, and for the part that they play in determining the calendar. Moreover, a reference here to *two* entities—respectively male and female, as the sun and the moon always are—furnishes the best balance for the remainder of this division of the invocation (5–12), wherein the other deities apostrophized are also treated in pairs, male and female—Liber and Ceres, Fauns and Dryads.

[832]Here *sacraria Ditis* seems to mean much the same as *Ditis. . . infernas. . . domos* (5.731–732) or *domos Ditis* (6.269). That is, it refers not to the shrine but to the abode of the god. Conversely, the temple of a god was often thought of as his dwelling: compare 6.53 attonitae magna ora *domus* and 6.81 ostia. . . *domus* (in 6.41 *templa* is used of the same structure).

Vestae; 6.280 Eumenidum *thalami* et *Discordia*; 2.310–312[833] iam Deiphobi dedit . . . ruinam . . . *domus*, iam proximus ardet *Ucalegon*[834]. It is noteworthy that in each of these examples the noun indicating a place, which is made coordinate with a noun indicating a person, is itself accompanied by the genitive case of a second noun indicating a person[835], which would really form a better parallel than the word it modifies for the other noun indicating a person[836]. Thus the last example given may be treated as a fusion of the perfectly literal and straightforward *Deiphobi domus* . . ., *Ucalegontis* and the figurative *Deiphobus* . . ., *Ucalegon*, this figurative use resulting from the identification of a man with his house.

In a passage in which a man seems to be similarly identified with his ship, 1.181–183 *Anthea* si quem iactatum vento videat Phrygiasque *biremis* aut *Capyn*[837], the place of the limiting genitive found in the preceding examples is taken by the adjective *Phrygias*, since *Phrygias . . . biremis* is virtually equivalent to *Phrygum biremis*[838].

The last two instances are not quite like most of those listed here. In the majority of passages under consideration, we find a combination of members which are not really parallel or coordinate in thought. Thus in 6.280[839] it is equally true that the *chambers* of the Eumenides are seen on the threshold of Hades, and that Discord *herself* is seen there; but, none the less, *thalami* and *Discordia*, being entities of such different types, do not form an absolutely correlative pair. On the other hand, in these last two passages, 2.310–312 and 1.181–183, we have a collocation of members which on the surface seem non-parallel, but which we find can readily be made parallel if we substitute for one of them the equivalent in place of which it is figuratively employed. Thus in the former passage *Ucalegon* really means *Ucalegontis domus*, and in the latter *Anthea* probably means *Anthei biremem* (since Aeneas on the shore can surely not expect to see his

[833]In this example *domus* and *Ucalegon* correspond, although they are not actually connected. Instead of a conjunction we have the double *iam . . . iam* (compare note 46); and instead of a common predicate we have two separate verbs that are used as close parallels implying much the same state of affairs, *dedit . . . ruinam* and *ardet*. For the change in verb, compare 5.563–571 (cited on 194), 12.328–329 (cited on 200), and G. 1.338–339 (cited on 227).

[834]With the use of the name *Ucalegon* in the sense of *Ucalegontis domus*, compare 3.275 aperitur Apollo, where *Apollo* = *Apollinis templum*.

[835]Successively *Ditis*, *Vestae*, *Vestae*, *Eumenidum*, *Deiphobi*.

[836]Compare 165 and note 699.

[837]But this example is not quite like the others, since the ships designated by *Phrygias . . . biremis* include those of Antheus and Capys. See 224–231.

[838]Compare what was said above (116) of 7.358.

[839]Cited two paragraphs back. C. explains *thalami* as standing "for the Furies and their chambers". It may be noted that with this noun we must supply some verb such as *sunt* or *videntur*, the latter suggested by *tum* in 278; the only verb expressed in the passage, *habitant* in 275, no longer fits when we reach 280.

individual friends, but is merely straining his eyes to catch a glimpse of their ships).

(2) Word for Place a Proper Noun

In the same way we find a place-name joined with a name or other word designating people where the thought really demands two terms for persons or two terms for places[840]. For instance in 3.129 *Cretam proavos*que petamus, *proavos* really means, as K.[2] indicates, not 'our forefathers' but 'the land of our forefathers', though it is far more vivid and effective than a more precise substitute would be. 1.380 *Italiam* quaero patriam et *genus* ab Iove summo seems similar. 3.170–171 *Corythum terras*que requirat *Ausonias* may also be compared, since the phrase *terras . . . Ausonias* is equivalent to the proper noun *Ausoniam*; but the meaning of *Corythum* is not quite certain: see note 1030.

Such collocation generally occurs in lengthy enumerations, where it seems to be Vergil's practice to use every device at his command to obtain variety and thus avoid monotony and consequent tediousness[841]. Names of peoples, countries, cities, rivers, and mountains[842] are grouped more or less indiscriminately to stand for various ethnographical or geographical entities. Instances are G. 1.56–59 vides . . . ut *Tmolus* odores, *India* mittit ebur, . . . tura *Sabaei*, at *Chalybes* . . . ferrum, virosaque *Pontus* castorea, Eliadum palmas *Epirus* equarum?; G. 2.137–139 nec . . . *Ganges* atque . . . *Hermus* laudibus Italiae certent, non *Bactra* neque *Indi* totaque . . . *Panchaia*; G. 3.30–31 addam *urbes Asiae* domitas pulsumque *Niphaten*[843] . . . -que . . . *Parthum*; G. 4.210–211 *Aegyptus* et . . . *Lydia* nec *populi Parthorum* aut Medus *Hydaspes*; G. 4.461–463 flerunt *Rhodopeiae arces* altaque *Pangaea* et Rhesi *Mavortia tellus* atque *Getae* atque *Hebrus*; 8.705–706 omnis . . . *Aegyptus* et *Indi*, omnis *Arabs*, omnes . . . *Sabaei*;

[840]Naturally, I am not listing examples of the collocation of names of persons and places where each retains its own significance, as is the case, for instance, in 1.6–7, 6.838–839, 7.371–372. These passages have their own peculiarities, each exemplifying a sort of zeugma; but they do not belong here. Compare note 849. The entire question of the confusion of geographical and ethnographical terms is an extremely interesting one. The phenomenon is of frequent occurrence in Vergil. I hope to publish at some future time a study of its genesis and its variations, with numerous examples from Vergil that would not be apposite to the present discussion.

[841]Compare note 358, and on the first example listed here (G. 1.56–59), note 934.

[842]The combination of mountains and rivers may have been facilitated by two factors: (1) the mythical and poetical custom of personifying these geographical entities, striking examples of which are found in Vergil's description of Atlas (4.246–251) and of the Nile (8.711–713); (2) the custom of introducing representations of mountains and rivers in triumphs, side by side with human captives, a custom which doubtless throws light on the reference to Niphates in G. 3.30, whether a mountain or a river is meant.

[843]Compare note 842.

11.428 *Aetolus* et *Arpi*; 8.638 *Romulidis Tatio*que seni *Curibus*que severis[844].

8.635 *Romam* et raptas sine more *Sabinas* is in the same class as the preceding examples if *Romam* stands for *Romanos*, as, e.g., *Curibus* just below[845] undoubtedly stands for *Sabinis*, and *Aegyptus* a little farther on[846] for *Aegyptii*. On the other hand the line may mean just what it says, that is, it may serve to delineate the scene and the actors[847]. Certainly, however, those designated by *Sabinas* are not the only actors, and *Romanos* must be understood from *Romam*, whether the two terms are equivalent or not—unless we wish to say that the mere use of the passive in the vivid '*ab urbe condita*'[848] phrase *raptas . . . Sabinas* is sufficient in itself to imply the presence of the agents as well as of the victims.

b. PERSON OR PERSONS AND GROUP

The name of a single person may be combined with a collective noun denoting a group of persons[849], as in 11.603–604 *Messapus* . . . celeresque *Latini* et . . . *Coras* et . . . *ala* Camillae. This instance is to a slight degree complicated by the insertion of the name of an entire people between the names of two leaders. As for the combination of the proper nouns *Messapus* and *Coras* with the collective

---

[844]It seems to me true that, as C. says, the words *Tatioque . . . Curibusque* stand for Tatius and his nation, just as the single word *Romulidis* stands for Romulus and his (the patronymic thus includes the founder of the country called after him, exactly as *Aeneadae* in 1.157 includes Aeneas himself). In other words, *Curibus* is used metaphorically for *Sabinis*, from the rank and file of whom the king is here separated (we may recall *senatus populusque*, and the Vergilian examples compared with it, note 816): for such a combination of the leader and his followers, expressed in perfectly literal language, compare note 849. Apart from the greater picturesqueness gained by the use of a figure of this sort—a very common and natural one, moreover—Vergil's choice of a substitute for *Sabinis* may have been partially conditioned by the fact of his having employed the word *Sabinas* just above (line 635, cited in the following paragraph). His use of the word *Romam* in the same line, in combination with *Sabinas*, may have provided the suggestion of a parallel for the other city-name *Curibus* in line 638.

[845]Line 638, quoted just above. [846]Line 705.

[847]As does G. 4.482–483 *Tartara . . . -que . . . Eumenides*.

[848]Probably. See 112.

[849]Of course there are instances where the coordination of an individual leader and his band of followers seems logical enough, as 10.352–353 *Halaesus* Auruncaeque *manus*, or even perhaps of individuals and some other leader's followers, as 2.414–415 *Aiax* et . . . *Atridae* Dolopumque *exercitus* omnis, 5.823–824 *Palaemon* . . . Phorcique *exercitus* (see 198–199), and 1.488–489 *se* quoque principibus permixtum agnovit Achivis, Eoasque *acies*; compare also 7.641–643 cantusque movete, qui bello exciti *reges*, quae quemque secutae complerint campos *acies* (discussed in note 569). It is not my intention to include such examples here (compare note 840).

noun *ala*, it may be noted[850] that the true balance of the proper names lies with the genitive (*Camillae*) which modifies the collective. With *Camillae* corresponds *Tiburti* in 11.518–519 *Messapus* . . . *turmae*que Latinae Tiburtique *manus*.

11.834–835 *copia* Teucrum Tyrrhenique *duces* Euandrique Arcades *alae* is very similar: once more we have the uniting of people[851], leaders (not specifically named, however), and group, or rather, in this instance, groups, of soldiery.

A comparable but still more irregular combination is to be found in 5.563–571 una *acies* iuvenum, ducit quam . . . Priamus . . .; alter *Atys* ⟨ducit⟩ . . .; extremus . . . *Iulus* . . . est invectus, where as forms corresponding to *una acies* . . ., *ducit quam* . . . *Priamus*, we find *alter Atys* and *extremus* . . . *Iulus*[852].

c. PERSON OR PERSONS AND ARMS

In 1.489 Eoasque *acies* et nigri Memnonis *arma*, *acies* is again parallel in thought to a name denoting a single person, the genitive *Memnonis*. In form, however, it is made parallel to a still more incongruous term, the word *arma*[853]. The word *arma* is made parallel to the name of a people in 12.78–79 non Teucros agat in Rutulos; Teucrum *arma*[854] quiescant et *Rutuli*; and to the names of individuals[855] in 1.181–183 *Anthea* si quem . . . videat Phrygiasque biremis[856] aut *Capyn* aut . . . *arma* Caici[857]. In both these instances the true parallel again appears as a limiting genitive[858].

---

[850]See 191 and note 836. [851]For *copia Teucrum* = *Teucri*, compare 196.

[852]We may note also a slight lack of concinnity in the modifiers, *una*, *alter*, and *extremus*. On the general shift in view-point throughout the passage, see 84.

[853]As K. points out, the two expressions present but a single idea (see his Introduction, K.[1] § 222, K.[2] § 251, on "parallelism"); but it is an idea expressed in two decidedly different ways.

[854]N. calls *Teucrum arma* "a variation to avoid the repetition of 'Teucri'". However, the form used earlier in this passage is not *Teucri*, but *Teucros*, which is repeated just as much by *Teucrum* as by *Teucri*; hence we must ascribe the inconcinnity simply to Vergil's love of variety. This love of variety has been ignored at times: there is actually MS. support for *Rutulum* (adopted by Heinsius and Heyne), which gives a better balanced but perhaps less Vergilian reading.

[855]Compare further the well-known *arma virumque* of 1.1, and other instances of the same sort. See 236–237, especially notes 1103 and 1105.

[856]Note also *biremis*, which from one point of view may be regarded as a little like *acies* in 1.489, though from another point of view it has already (191) been classed with words like *thalami* and *domus*.

[857]This example differs from the other two, in that in them *arma* + a genitive is a mere periphrasis, while here *arma*, as C. says, "is rightly taken by Wagn. and Wund. in its strict sense". N. considers *arma* literally used in 12.78 also, but the word does not seem to me to have the full concrete force there that it possesses in 1.183.

[858]*Teucrum*, *Caici*.

B. EXAMPLES IN WHICH LEADING WORD IN ONE MEMBER IS IN THOUGHT PARALLEL WITH DEPENDENT WORD IN OTHER MEMBER

1. EXAMPLES INVOLVING NOUNS

a. ONE MEMBER A PERIPHRASIS

Attention has been called frequently[859] to the fact that, when two incongruous nouns are paired, one of these nouns is often accompanied by a genitive which is the true parallel of the other[860]. Very frequently the noun with its limiting genitive constitutes a mere periphrasis, conveying an idea that could be presented by the use alone, in the appropriate case, of the substantive that in the periphrasis appears in the genitive[861].

Here we may certainly see an instance of fusion. The periphrasis should in strict logic be used either in both members of the pair or in neither. Thus the first example given below represents a fusion of *Emathiam et Haemum* and *Emathiae et Haemi campos*; and the other examples that follow may be similarly resolved.

The substantive thus unnecessarily interpolated may denote any one of a variety of possibilities.

(1) Place

Place is denoted in G. 1.492 *Emathiam* et latos *Haemi . . . campos*, 10.51–52 est *Amathus*, est celsa mihi *Paphus* atque *Cythera Idaliae*que *domus*, G. 2.115 Eoasque *domos Arabum* pictosque *Gelonos*[862].

[859]On pages 191 and 194.

[860]Three additional examples of this, which it has not been convenient to list anywhere else, may be mentioned here. One is G. 2.323 ver adeo *frondi nemorum*, ver utile *silvis*, which, though the combination of *frondi* and *silvis* is not especially incongruous, still appears to represent a fusion of *nemoribus . . . silvis* and *frondi nemorum . . . silvarum* (*nemoribus* would of course have been impossible in dactylic hexameter; compare note 24). On the repetition of *ver*, which seems to serve still more to soften the incongruity, slight as it is, see note 46. The second example is E. 4.53–54 longae maneat *pars* ultima *vitae*, *spiritus* et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta, a fusion of *longae maneat pars vitae*, *spiritus* (genitive) *et quantum sat erit* and *longa maneat vita*, *spiritus* (nominative) *et quantum sat erit*. The third is 5.394 non *laudis amor* nec *gloria*, a fusion of *non laudis amor nec gloriae* and *non laus nec gloria*. C., however, regards *gloria* as used instead of *gloriae amor*, "by a tour de force similar to, though not identical with that by which 'laus' has just been used (v. 355) for 'merita' ". This would involve a metonymy such as that noted in connection with *dolores* in 1.25 (see 156–157, and for examples with *laus* itself, see note 654); but the shift of meaning from effect to cause undergone by *laus* and perhaps by *dolores* is scarcely parallel to what would be involved here.

[861]The case is more or less analogous to the coordination of two nouns one of which is in thought parallel not with the other noun but with an adjective modifier of that other noun. See 162 and 165–166.

[862]Here *domos Arabum* must stand for *Arabos* to afford a parallel for *Gelonos*. However, strict logic demands rather that we change the latter to (*domos*) *Gelonorum*, since the reference is to a place rather than to a people (compare 192).

(2) Group of Persons

Groups of persons are denoted in 9.154 cum *Danais* . . . et *pube Pelasga*[863], 4.544 *Tyriis* omnique *manu* . . . *meorum*, 7.729–730 *Saticulus* . . . *Oscorum*que *manus*, 11.449–450 *Teucros Tyrrhenam*que *manum*, 7.710–711 *Amiterna cohors* priscique *Quirites*, *Ereti manus* omnis oliviferaeque *Mutuscae*[864], 11.834–835 *copia Teucrum* Tyrrhenique *duces* Euandrique Arcades *alae*. It may be noted that in three of these passages, 9.154, 11.449–450, and 7.710–711, an adjective replaces the genitive that usually limits the superfluous substantive: compare what is said on page 191 of 1.181–183.

In the last of the instances cited in the preceding paragraph, there is a further complication, since *copia Teucrum*, which = *Teucri*, is combined, not with its exact parallels *Tyrrheni* and *Arcades*, but with (*Tyrrheni*) *duces* and (*Arcades*) *alae*[865]. Because of this additional peculiarity, the passage has been noted above (194).

(3) Race

Race is denoted in 1.743 *hominum genus* et *pecudes*, 6.728–729 *hominum pecudum*que *genus* vitaeque volantum et quae . . . fert *monstra* . . . pontus[866], G. 3.242–244 *genus* . . . *hominum*que *ferarum*que et *genus aequoreum*[867], *pecudes* pictaeque *volucres*, in furias ignemque ruunt[868], G. 3.264–265 quid *lynces* . . . et *genus* acre *luporum* atque *canum*?

With these instances may be grouped 12.529–530 *atavos* et *avorum* . . . *nomina* per regesque actum genus, where *nomina* seems to suggest the successive generations of Murranus's ancestors[869]. Note the use

---

[863]Note that in this and the following example the two members are practically synonymous. Examples of this type are particularly helpful in the study of hendiadys. Compare note 598.

[864]These nouns are followed by a further variety—a series of *qui* clauses. See 91 and note 358.

[865]It should be noted that *alae* is a collective noun of a distinctly different type from *copia*, being more concrete and more specific.

[866]This passage is cited as an example of the grouping of *hominum pecudumque genus* with *monstra* (on which see also 90). The phrase *vitae* . . . *volantum* forms an additional periphrasis.

[867]Note once more the use of the adjective instead of the genitive. Compare what was said above of 9.154, 11.449–450, and 7.710–711.

[868]It may be that this and the following passage do not present examples of the mere empty periphrasis. On the contrary, there may be some particular point in the use of *genus*, inasmuch as the motive force behind generation is under consideration. But this does not alter or ameliorate the irregularity. For similar statements as to other periphrases, see 197, on *formae* in 7.18; note 881, on *facies* in 2.601; 199, on *ora* in 7.575; and note 891, on *corpora* in a number of instances.

[869]For another (but probably unacceptable) interpretation of the passage, see 168–169.

of *genus*[870] in combination with it, and compare the similar use of *proles* in G. 3.35–36 Assaraci *proles* demissaeque ab Iove gentis *nomina*.

8.269–270 *Potitius* . . . et *domus*[871] . . . *Pinaria* also falls into this class, since *domus* . . . *Pinaria* = *domus Pinari*[872].

Perhaps with these other instances of collective nouns we may class also G. 4.388–389 *piscibus* . . . et iuncto *bipedum curru* . . . *equorum*, where *curru* has the sense of 'team', and *iuncto bipedum curru* . . . *equorum* is simply a periphrasis for (*iunctis*) *bipedibus equis*.

(4) Appearance or Form

Appearance or form is denoted by such words as *monstrum*, *forma*, *imago*, *effigies*, *facies*, *os*. Examples follow.

In 8.698–699 *deum monstra* et latrator *Anubis* contra *Neptunum* et *Venerem* contraque *Minervam*, *deum monstra* = *di monstruosi*, and accordingly is joined with *latrator Anubis* and contrasted with *Neptunum*, *Venerem*, *Minervam*.

In 6.285–289 variarum *monstra ferarum*, *Centauri* . . . *Scyllae*que . . . et . . . *Briareus* ac *belua* Lernae . . . flammisque armata *Chimaera*, *Gorgones Harpyiae*que et *forma* tricorporis *umbrae*, *monstra ferarum* = *ferae monstruosae*, and so *Centauri*, *Scyllae*, etc., are in apposition[873] with *monstra* instead of with *ferarum* as they should be. Note, however, at the close *forma tricorporis umbrae* instead of *tricorpor*[874] *umbra*.

Concerning 7.17–20 *sues* atque . . . *ursi* . . . ac *formae* . . . *luporum*, quos hominum ex facie . . . induerat Circe in vultus ac terga ferarum, C. explains that the use of *formae* is to be accounted for on the ground that "they were men in the form of wolves". But, as has been said (note 868), there is of course lack of concinnity whether the periphrasis is a mere empty one or whether it has some special significance. The fusion is continued in the following line, where we should have either *quos* (referring to *luporum*) *ex hominibus*, or *quas* (referring to *formae*) *hominum ex facie*.

In 2.560–563 subiit . . . *genitoris imago* . . ., subiit[875] . . . *Creusa* et . . . *domus* et . . . *casus Iuli*[876], still another element of inconcinnity

[870]For the connection between *nomen* and *genus*, see note 715.

[871]For *domus* in the sense of 'house' or 'line', compare Horace, Carmina 1.6.8 saevam Pelopis domum, of which there is an echo in Il Penseroso 99, "Pelops' line".

[872]See note 867.

[873]Since apposition is as much an example of coordination as is connection by a copulative conjunction, this example is not out of place here.

[874]According to G.-L., § 85.1, the form *tricorpor* does not exist.

[875]'Connective repetition': compare note 46. [876]For *casus Iuli*, see 209–210.

is introduced by the abstract noun *casus*, which balances the concrete nouns *Creusa* and *domus*[877].

We may compare two other instances with *imago*, 6.479–480 hic illi occurrit *Tydeus*, hic[878] . . . *Parthenopaeus* et *Adrasti* . . . *imago*, and 7.180 *Saturnus*que . . . *Iani*que . . . *imago*; also 3.497 *effigiem Xanthi Troiam*que.

3.426 *hominis facies* et pulchro pectore *virgo* might be classed as a fusion of *hominis facies et pulchrum* (or *pulchrae*) *pectus virginis* and *homo facie et pulchro pectore virgo*[879]. However, to assume that a fusion of this sort has given rise to the expression cited here, we must understand *facies* as referring definitely to the face just as *pectore* does to the breast. But I should rather take *facies* as referring to the whole external appearance[880]. This is the sense that it probably possesses in 2.601–603 non tibi *Tyndaridis facies* invisa Lacaenae[881] culpatusve *Paris*, divum *inclementia*, divum, has evertit opes; and that it undoubtedly possesses in 5.822–824 *comitum facies*, immania

---

[877]See 188. [878]See note 875.

[879]The latter form, however, could hardly have been used, since *facie*, which would have to be classed as an ablative of specification, is much less natural than *pulchro pectore*, which is probably an ablative of quality.

[880]Compare K's. Vocabulary, s.v. Indeed, I doubt whether the word *facies* in Vergil ever denotes the face specifically, in the purely physical sense that we generally give *face* in English. There are a few instances where it might have this sense, but none where it must. It seems to have this meaning in 10.699 occupat os faciemque, but it is perhaps the more specific noun with which it is combined that thus defines and limits its application. We may note the other two instances of this combination, 1.658 faciem mutatus et ora, where K. renders the words by "figure" and "features", and 7.328–329 tot sese vertit in ora, tam saevae facies, where C. renders by "aspects" and "forms". We likewise find the word combined with *membra* in three instances, in all of which it probably refers to the appearance as a whole. These are 5.357–358 faciem ostentabat et udo turpia membra fimo, where *faciem* is rendered by C. (in his Translation) as "features", but is interpreted by Henry and N. as "plight, condition, appearance"; 7.415–416 Allecto torvam faciem et furialia membra exuit, for which C. compares 5.619 faciemque deae vestemque reponit, where the meaning is indubitably 'form, shape, appearance'; and 9.734 agnoscunt faciem invisam atque immania membra, for which C. compares 2.601 Tyndaridis facies invisa Lacaenae, where (even though one is certainly tempted to compare "Was this the face that launched a thousand ships. . .?") C. is doubtless right in explaining *facies invisa* as "the hated beauty". In 12.416 Venus obscuro faciem circumdata nimbo, the entire person seems referred to; and similarly the whole physique may be meant in G. 3.58 faciem tauro propior, although C. appears to take *faciem* here of the face, as he shows in his comment, "probably = 'latis frontibus' ".

[881]*Tyndaridis facies invisa Lacaenae* has already been referred to, in note 880. It is, of course, whatever be the meaning of *facies*, far more than a mere periphrasis. It is not so much Helen herself, as her *facies*, whether that be her face or her beauty, that works havoc. Once more, compare the immortal exclamation of Dr. Faustus quoted in note 880. *Tyndaridis facies* is, moreover, an excellent coordinate for *divum inclementia*, far better than *culpatus. . . Paris*, which we should have to replace by *culpa Paridis* in order to obtain perfect parallelism. As for *divum inclementia*, that is not a periphrasis at all. We may contrast with it *inclementia mortis* in G. 3.68 (see 205).

cete[882], et senior Glauci *chorus*[883] Inousque *Palaemon Tritones*que . . . Phorcique *exercitus*[883], in 8.298 nec te ullae[884] *facies*, non[885] terruit ipse *Typhoeus*, and in 2.412 *armorum facie* et Graiarum *errore iubarum*. The incongruity of this last passage as it stands is not so striking as it might be, simply because it is double instead of single: the two peculiarities, like two negatives, neutralize each other[886]. But if we follow C. in expanding these words into *errore e facie armorum et Grais iubis orto*, the irregularity is at once obvious, since the regular form would be either *errore e facie armorum et iubarum orto* or *errore ex armis et iubis orto*.

In 12.335–336 *Formidinis ora Iraeque Insidiaeque*, it would be natural to take *Irae* as a genitive singular like *Formidinis*, especially as there is no reason for the use of the plural, but of course *Insidiae* must be nominative plural. (We find *iraeque insidiaeque* also in 7.326.)

In 4.511 tergeminamque *Hecaten*, tria virginis *ora Dianae*[887], *tria*. . . *ora Dianae* is a little more than a mere periphrasis[888]: it stands by hypallage for *Diana trium orum*, which would properly balance the expression with which it is in apposition, namely *tergeminam*. . . *Hecaten*.

In 7.575 *Almonem* puerum foedatique *ora Galaesi*, *ora* keeps its own meaning even more decidedly. *Ora Galaesi*, as C. says, "is not a mere periphrasis, but fixes attention on the face, as the part in which the ghastliness and disfigurement of his violent death were most visible"[889].

[882]See note 873. [883]Compare 193–194, especially note 849; also note 1047.

[884]Here the customary genitive is replaced by *ullae*, which = *ullorum*. Compare note 867.

[885]The combination *nec. . . non* gives us what is virtually an example of 'connective repetition'. Compare note 166, and, for a closer parallel (6.553–554), note 925.

[886]The two expressions, consisting as they do each of an ablative with a limiting genitive, *look* parallel. For a different sort of appeal to the eye, see note 87. For other instances of the phenomenon observed in the example under discussion here, see G. 1.204–205 (note 911) and 10.496–497 (208).

[887]See note 873. [888]Compare note 868.

[889]Such "ghastliness and disfigurement" seem especially grievous in the case of Galaesus, who must have been a highly respected member of society by reason of his wealth (*ditissimus arvis*, 537), even more by reason of his justice (*iustissimus unus*, 536) and his love of peace (he had been cut down while trying to act as mediator, 536), and above all by reason of his old age. Vergil shows particular tenderness for old age and for youth, and particular sympathy when sorrow or death comes to old age or to youth, as I have tried to illustrate in some detail in an article entitled Vergil and the "Under-Dog", in Transactions of the American Philological Association 56 (1925), 185–212 (on this particular episode, see 194–195). It should be noted that Almo, Galaesus's fellow-victim, represents youth as Galaesus represents old age; he is called *iuvenis* in 531, and, what is more significant, *puerum* in 575. The use of *puerum* here serves to heighten the pitifulness of Almo's death, as *foedati* and *ora* serve to heighten the pitifulness of the death of the venerable Galaesus.

(5) Part of the Body

The last example just given, in which the meaning of the noun of the periphrasis is not to be lost sight of[890], and perhaps to a lesser extent all the instances of the use of *os*, might possibly have been classed, instead of in the category in which they are placed, in one dealing with the body[891] and parts of the body.

Of this new category, a typical example is 7.535 *corpora* multa *virum* . . . seniorque *Galaesus* ⟨sternuntur⟩.

Similar is 12.328–329 *multa virum* . . . dat fortia *corpora* leto, seminecis volvit *multos*. Here *multa virum. . .dat fortia corpora leto = multos* (*viros*) *fortes dat leto*, and is therefore parallel in thought though not in form to *seminecis volvit multos*[892], as in 2.310–312 the words of the second clause are parallel in thought though not in form to those of the first[893].

Other passages of much the same sort are G. 4.475–476 = 6.306–307 *matres* atque *viri* defunctaque *corpora* vita magnanimum *heroum*, *pueri* innuptaeque *puellae*; and 9.272–273 lectissima *matrum corpora captivos*que.

We may also compare 7.649–650 *Lausus*, *quo* pulchrior alter non fuit excepto Laurentis *corpore Turni*[894], which logically should be either *quo pulchrior alter non fuit excepto Laurente Turno*, or *cuius corpore pulchrius alterum non fuit excepto Laurentis corpore Turni*[895]—the former too bald, the latter far too precise, for poetry.

In 1.634–635 viginti *tauros*, magnorum horrentia centum *terga suum*,. . .centum. . .*agnos*, the words *magnorum horrentia centum terga suum = centum magnos horrentibus tergis sues*.

C. finds a parallel to this passage in G. 4.13–14 picti squalentia *terga lacerti. . .meropes* que, and as a paraphrase for *squalentia terga*

---

[890]Compare note 891, also note 868.

[891]It should not be assumed that *corpora* in the following examples is utterly redundant. On the contrary, its use is doubtless deliberate and suggestive (compare note 890). Thus the first three examples cited all refer to death; the second and the third may also, as P. says of G. 4.475, call attention to the heroic build of those mentioned (for this we may compare further 2.18 delecta virum. . .corpora of those especially chosen for the dangerous task of opening up the hostile town of Troy), while physical beauty is involved in the last; and the fourth implies that in the women, who are mere slaves or chattels, only the physical side counts.

[892]In 9.454–455 ad ipsa *corpora* seminecisque *viros* we see the same contrast between *corpora* (this time without a genitive) and *seminecis*. See on this below, 238. We may note also 11.634–635 *corpora*que et permixti caede virorum semianimes volvuntur *equi*.

[893]See 191 and note 833.

[894]As Lausus is placed on a footing here with a *corpus*, so is Nisus in 5.318–319 ante omnia *corpora* Nisus emicat. Perhaps here the use of *corpora* of his rivals tends to bring Nisus more vividly into relief. As compared to him, they constitute an inert mass, while he flashes ahead like something less corporeal, the wind or the lightning.

[895]For the 'compendiary comparison', compare note 260.

lacerti offers *lacertus squalenti tergo*. But by doing so he absolutely fails to take into account the discrepancy in number between *terga* and *lacerti*, a type of confusion which is relatively rare in Vergil[896]. I should therefore be inclined to one of two other possibilities, both of which involve taking *picti . . . lacerti* as a nominative plural, not as a genitive singular. One is to regard *squalentia terga* as an accusative of specification, in which case the passage is perfectly regular and has no place in the present discussion. The other is to put commas before and after *squalentia terga*, and to regard these two words as in apposition[897] with *picti . . . lacerti*. The rather peculiar word-order thus produced is one for which Vergil shows a particular fondness, especially in his early writings: exact parallels so far as word-order goes are E. 1.57 raucae, tua cura, palumbes, E. 1.74 meae, . . . felix pecus, . . . capellae, E. 2.3 densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos[898], E. 9.9 veteres, . . . fracta cacumina, fagos; very similar are E. 3.3 infelix . . ., oves, pecus, G. 4.168 ignavum, fucos, pecus, G. 4.246 dirum, tiniae, genus. For the apposition between whole and part[899], there are plenty of Vergilian parallels, e. g. E. 2.3 and E. 9.9, just cited; 2.348–349, 5.729, and 5.750–751, mentioned below (202); and 11.336–339 Drances, . . . dextera, for which see 114–115[900].

In connection with the passage just cited, in which *dextera* is in apposition with a man's name, we may note a passage in which *dextra* is made coordinate with a man's name: 12.96–97 te . . . *Actor*, te[901] *Turni . . . dextra* gerit[902].

[896]I have found very few examples (see 5–7), and of these only two present anything like a parallel. One is 2.219 (5–6) <serpentes> superant *capite* et *cervicibus*: it is more natural to talk of the *head* and *necks* of *two* snakes, than of the *backs* of one lizard. The other is 2.57 (6) manus *iuvenem* . . . post *terga* revinctum: this is certainly a much closer parallel; but then the frequent need for the phrase *post terga* to describe the treatment of a *group* of men (see note 25), and possibly even the plural number of *manus*, which will remain unchanged whether the statement concerns one man or many, may play a part. Metrical convenience may also be involved, since *terga* fits into the fifth foot (where it occurs in both G. 4.13 and 2.57) more readily than would *tergum*: but on this point see 4.

[897]Compare note 873.

[898]Here, too, there is a possibility that the interpolated phrase is an accusative of specification, not an appositive. But C's. arguments in refutation of this statement seem very strong.

[899]See G.-L., § 323, Note 2.

[900]The examples of this type of apposition cited by Stolz-Schmalz[5] (page 384), 10.698–699 Latagum . . . occupat os faciemque and 12.273–276 horum unum . . . transadigit costas, seem less certain to me, since in both these instances the supposed appositive might conceivably be an accusative of specification. This is true, too, of the two passages from the Iliad, 5.79–80 and 7.14–16, offered as parallels by N. in his note on 10.698, and of Iliad 11.420–421, the first example cited by Goodwin (§ 917) as an instance of this type of apposition; and Iliad 1.24, Goodwin's second example, is also not convincing, since there we find two datives of which the second may be local. We may remark that in regard to 12.273–276 K. has a somewhat different view, since he compares 2. 438–441, where there is almost an anacoluthon.

[901]'Connective repetition'. Compare note 46.

[902]Compare lines 78–79 just above (referred to on 194).

In 11.215–216 hic *matres* miseraeque *nurus*, hic[903] cara *sororum pectora* maerentum *puer*ique, *cara . . . maerentum = maerentes sorores pectoribus caris*, or, more logically perhaps, by a double transfer of epithet, *carae sorores maerentibus pectoribus*[904].

2.348–349 *iuvenes*, fortissima . . . *pectora*, as has already been remarked (just above), is an example not of correlation but of apposition[905], which depends on the same principle. 5.729 *iuvenes*, fortissima *corda*, and 5.750–751 transcribunt urbi *matres populum*que volentem deponunt, *animos* nil magnae laudis egentis[906] are exact parallels for 2.348–349.

Much like the use of *animos* in the preceding example is[907] that of *animam* in 6.817–818 Tarquinios *reges animam*que superbam . . . *Bruti*. With the four examples preceding this, especially the last, to serve as transition, we have gradually passed from the purely physical to what a modern would be tempted to class as the mental or the spiritual; but, in view of the material character of the *anima* as viewed by the ancients[908], this example may surely be listed here in a section dealing with parts of the body[909].

Finally, since what the *anima* is to the whole man, the *spiritus* may perhaps be said to be to the *os*, it may not be amiss to note here G. 4.300 *nares* et *spiritus oris*, in which C. calls *spiritus oris* an amplification for *os*[910].

(6) Material

I find several passages in which material[911] is denoted.

G. 1.77–78 urit enim *lini* campum *seges*, urit[912] *avenae*, urunt[912] . . . *papavera* may be treated as representing a fusion of *linus*, *avena*,

---

[903]See note 901. [904]Compare 1.634–635 (200) and 4.511 (199).

[905]Compare note 873.

[906]Unless we accept the other interpretation mentioned by Servius, which omits the stop after *deponunt* and inserts one after *volentem*.

[907]Since *animam* here practically = *umbram*, the expression might have been classed also with such examples as 6.480 *Parthenopaeus* et *Adrasti . . . imago* (see 198). For another possibility still, see note 909.

[908]See 151–152.

[909]Still, in a sense it belongs in the section dealing with nouns of quality (204–208), since *animam . . . Bruti = animosum Brutum*, just as, e. g., in G. 1.92 (205) *potentia solis = potens sol*. See below, 204–205 and note 922.

[910]As is so frequently the case in passages of this sort, it is possible to treat this as an example of fusion—of *nares et os* and *narium et spiritus oris*.

[911]Perhaps this category comes nearer than any other to suiting one example that is particularly hard to classify. This is G. 1.204–205 sunt *Arcturi sidera* nobis *Haedorum*que *dies* servandi et lucidus *Anguis*. *Arcturi sidera* virtually = *Arcturus*; and in another sense *Haedorum . . . dies* virtually = *Haedi*; thus the two are roughly parallel to each other (compare 199, especially note 886, on 2.412) and to *Anguis*.

[912]'Connective repetition' and 'connective variant repetition' are combined here. For the first, compare note 46; for the second, note 225.

papavera and *lini seges, avenae, papaverum*; but, since *lini. . .seges* is merely a periphrasis for *linum*, the passage may be regarded as exhibiting mere variety rather than absolute fusion. The other examples here cited may be handled in the same way.

Very similar to the preceding passage is G. 1.212 *lini segetem* et . . . *papaver*.

G. 1.219 *triticeam* in *messem* robustaque *farra* differs from the two preceding examples only in that an adjective of material, *triticeam*, replaces the genitive of material, *lini*[913].

We may note together 9.87 *picea trabibus*que . . . *acernis*[913] and 6.181 *fraxineae*que *trabes* . . . et . . . *robur*[913]. In connection with the second of these, it may be remarked that the terms used for the various other trees enumerated in the same passage[914], while not directly connected grammatically with the nouns here cited, are parallel therewith: *piceae, ilex, ornos*. The use of the adjective *fraxineae* may have been in part dictated by the exigencies of the meter. See the discussion of the entire passage, above, 5 and 19.

In 1.640–641 ingens *argentum* mensis, caelataque in auro fortia *facta* patrum, more precise parallels would be *ingentia vasa mensis ex argento facta, caelataque in auro fortia facta patrum* (or, better still[915], *vasa ubi sunt caelata in auro fortia facta patrum*, or *vasa ex auro facta, ubi sunt caelata fortia facta patrum*[916]), and *ingens argentum mensis aurumque caelatum fortibus factis patrum*. This example, though it involves no actual periphrasis, seems sufficiently like the others treated here to be listed with them.

In G. 1.162 *vomis* et . . . *robur aratri, robur* may stand not for material but for quality, as it certainly does in 7.609–610 aeternaque ferri robora[917], which C. compares. Then *robur aratri* would be equivalent not to *aratrum ex robore factum*, but to *aratrum forte* or *grave*; and the example would fall rather into the next category. To this category, at all events, it forms an excellent transition[918].

---

[913]Compare note 867. [914]6.180–182.

[915]For the carving is only a *part* of the vessels. Compare 10.496–497 (207–208), and see especially note 939.

[916]Of course all these phrases, as ponderous as the *ingens argentum mensis* but scarcely so beautiful, are offered as examples of logic and not of poetry.

[917]In this passage, too, the periphrasis (*ferri robora = ferrum forte*) is made parallel to a concrete expression (*aerei . . . vectes*). There is an additional irregularity in that the equivalent of the periphrasis, *ferrum* itself, does not form a perfect parallel for this concrete noun, but rather balances the adjective that limits the latter, namely *aerei*. (Compare 162 on 5.311–312.) The two modifiers—the genitive *ferri* and the adjective *aerei*—correspond better than the two nouns modified. The same condition exists in 2.412 and G. 1.204–205 (for which see page 199 and note 911, respectively).

[918]Compare the similar doubt about the listing of 6.817–818 (see note 909).

(7) Quality

This new category deals with quality[919].

A typical instance is 6.64–65 *Ilium* et . . . *gloria Dardaniae*. Here again we may recognize either one of two phenomena[920]: fusion, of *Ili et gloria Dardaniae* and *Ilium et Dardania*; or mere love of variety, inducing the use of a periphrasis, 'the glory of Dardania', to represent 'glorious Dardania'[921].

On the other hand, probably only the second of these explanations would apply to 6.817–818 *Tarquinios reges animam*que superbam ultoris *Bruti*, if this example belongs in the present category[922]. It would not be so effective to recognize an instance of fusion here,

[919]This particular usage of course involves a combination of abstract and concrete. For this combination, see 141–152; and on the overlapping of categories, compare note 592. Concerning this type of periphrasis, we may observe what Hardie (cited in note 5) says (182–183) in the course of a highly interesting discussion of the genesis of the periphrastic mode of expression: "What is to <other people> a mere quality in a supposed 'thing' may be to <the poet> the central or more vividly conceived entity, of which the 'thing' is a particular and transitory manifestation." And again (184) he has this to say: "This poetic idiom by which some salient feature or quality of a thing is emphasised is not limited to the description of nature and natural objects. It is frequently used in the case of persons." An excellent example of this use in Vergil is 12.110 metum . . . Iuli, employed to describe Iulus at a moment when, as we should say in English by a somewhat similar idiom (though without the genitive that appears in Latin), he is *all fear*. This is pointed out below, 214. We may compare Poe's superb lines (To Helen, 9–10), ". . . the *glory* that was Greece, And the *grandeur* that was Rome". Here again the genitive of the Latin is lacking; but from "*the glory that was Greece*", it is only a short step to *the glory of Greece*, which would correspond precisely to *gloria Dardaniae* in 6.65 (cited just below). Here the genitive appears to be primarily appositional in type: compare note 944. A perfect example in English poetry of the phenomenon Hardie has in mind is provided by Swinburne's "Bind on thy sandals, O thou most fleet, Over the *splendour* and *speed* of thy feet" (lines 13–14 of the famous Chorus from Atalanta, beginning "When the hounds of spring are on winter's traces"). Even in prose, examples of this special type are not wholly lacking in English. We are employing an expression of the sort whenever we call a king 'Your *Majesty*' instead of 'you', or speak of some dignitary as 'his *Honor*' instead of saying 'the Judge' or 'the Mayor'. If we could go a step farther, and say, 'King George's *Majesty*', 'the Judge's *Honor*', we should have a perfect parallel for many a phrase of Vergil. On the same order is the Italian use in polite address of the third feminine singular, representing *Vostra Signoria*.

[920]Compare note 911.

[921]I doubt whether this latter phrase can be rendered literally in Latin. (Compare 208 on 2.453.) Certainly *gloriosa* would hardly do, even if metrical considerations did not make it impossible for Vergil's purposes. The lack of an adjective corresponding to *gloria* may well have been a contributing factor toward Vergil's choice of the periphrastic mode of expression in this particular instance.

[922]I am inclined, however, to believe that the expression does *not* belong in this category; for I think that *animam* here does not indicate a quality, but denotes the shade or soul that is to be embodied as Brutus. For this reason the example has been listed elsewhere (202). If the latter classification is correct, the explanation given above is no longer possible. On the other hand, we can easily recognize an instance of fusion here, for in this sense *animam* can be assigned as readily to a Tarquin as to Brutus. This interpretation of *animam* seems to me more to the point, since the idea of 'spirit' in the sense of 'courage'

since the laudatory *animam. . .superbam* is more suitably used of the avenging hero Brutus than of the tyrannical Tarquins[923]. Just as we said above that *gloria Dardaniae* means 'glorious Dardania', so we may say here that *animam. . .Bruti* means 'courageous Brutus'. The whole phrase *animam . . . superbam ultoris Bruti* may be said to be equivalent to *animosum superbumque ultorem Brutum*, a much less striking expression, and one, moreover, involving a pedestrian succession of accusatives that Vergil did well to avoid (compare note 932).

Similarly, in G. 3.68 et *labor* et durae rapit *inclementia mortis*[924], *durae. . .inclementia mortis=dura inclemensque mors*; but Vergil's expression is far more striking, emphasizing as it does the quality of death that makes death so dread. The ordinary prose phrase, with its commonplace coordination of adjectives, is far less effective. We may compare Horace's equally impressive semoti . . . tarda necessitas leti (Carmina 1.3.32–33).

In G. 1.92 *pluviae* rapidive *potentia solis*, *potentia solis=potens sol.*

6.553–554 *vis* ut nulla *virum*, non[925] ipsi exscindere bello *caelicolae* valeant is an interesting passage. From the point of view of logic, it represents a fusion of *nullus vir*[926], *non ipsi caelicolae* (i. e. *nullus caelicola*) and *vis nulla virum, non* (=*nulla*) *caelicolarum*. From the point of view of poetry, it is superior to either, since the phrase relating to the supreme, abstract *force of man* is particularly appropriate to lead up to the climactic reference to the *gods themselves*.

---

is already sufficiently given by the adjective *superbam*. Moreover, *animum* rather than *animam* might be called for in this special sense. However, it may be that Vergil wished to *suggest* this meaning even while using the word primarily in a different signification. This would be quite in accordance with his custom (see note 605).

[923]It may be noted that the epithet usually associated with Tarquin in a derogatory sense is here transferred in a complimentary sense to Tarquin's conqueror. See C. with reference to this.

[924]H. and P. punctuate so as to take *labor* with the preceding clause *subeunt morbi tristisque senectus*, instead of with *rapit*. But C. seems to make a good point in his note on the association of Labos and Letum in 6.277. P. also comments on this association; yet he does not adopt C's. punctuation.

[925]For the type of connection involved in *nulla. . .*, *non*, compare note 885, on *nec. . .ullae. . .*, *non* in 8.298. The similarity of the two passages extends also to the use of *ipsi* in 6.553 and *ipse* in 8.298.

[926]That *vis . . . virum* is simply a periphrasis for *fortes viri* is still more strikingly shown by G. 1.198–199 ni vis humana . . . maxima quaeque manu legeret, where the abstract *vis humana*, which is there equivalent to *homo* (compare *humana*), not *vir* (compare *vis*), is combined not very felicitously with the concrete *manu*. The latter, to be sure, is explained by P. as meaning 'carefully', and we may compare the English colloquial expression 'hand-picked', in the sense of 'chosen with care'; but still the conception that gave rise to *manu* is decidedly at odds with that behind *vis humana*.

We may compare with the foregoing example 12.198–199 Latonaeque *genus* duplex *Ianum*que . . ., *vim*que *deum* infernam et duri sacraria Ditis[927], 8.687–688 *Aegyptum viris*que *Orientis* et ultima . . . *Bactra*, and 4.132 ruunt *equites* et odora *canum vis*.

5.589–590 textum . . . *iter* ancipitemque mille *viis* habuisse *dolum*[928] is probably to be listed here, since *dolum* seems to denote a quality. Everywhere else[929] in Vergil *dolus* has an abstract significance, save only in two doubtful instances, 2.264 doli fabricator, where, just as here, either an abstract or a concrete meaning will do, and 6.29 dolos tecti ambagesque, which furnishes an excellent parallel for the present passage. To be sure, K. renders *dolum* here by 'maze'[930]; but, unlike F.-B., he does not include this meaning in his Vocabulary; and that he suggests it in his commentary merely as a paraphrase rather than as a literal translation is indicated by his additional comment in the Revised Edition, "lit., 'a cheat,' 'a deception.' "

We may compare 2.250–252 nox involvens . . . *terram*que *polum*que *Myrmidonum*que *dolos*. On this see further below, 231.

In 4.88–89 pendent *opera* interrupta *minae*que *murorum* ingentes aequataque *machina* caelo, *minae* . . . *murorum ingentes* = *minantes ingentesque muri* (or possibly *minantes magnopere muri*). It matters little whether we consider *murorum* an appositional genitive, as K. does,

---

[927]Note also *sacraria Ditis*, which adds another element of inconcinnity. Compare 190.

[928]The modifying phrase *mille viis*, referring to the accusative *dolum*, is a better parallel for the preceding accusative *iter* than *dolum* is. In this respect the passage resembles the others listed here. But otherwise it differs from them, since the periphrasis consists of an abstract noun (on the question whether it *is* abstract, see note 929) plus an ablative, not an abstract noun plus a genitive. However, *mille viis* is certainly the equivalent of *mille viarum*, as C. says; and *mille viarum dolum* would be sufficiently like the other passages to deserve consideration here. It would not be quite like them, it is true; for *mille viarum* would be a true genitive of quality (just as *mille viis* is an ablative of quality), and the genitive of the typical periphrasis does not fall so definitely into any category (compare note 944). That the genitive of the periphrasis is not a true genitive of quality is proved by the fact that it by no means needs a limiting adjective; indeed, it is unmodified far oftener than it is modified. We *may* find an adjective accompanying the genitive, as in G. 1.92–93 (205); but much more frequently, when an adjective is present, it is in agreement with the noun modified by the genitive, not with the genitive itself (see for instance G. 4.267–268, and the comment thereon, 207). Indeed, it is to be noted that in G. 1.92–93 *potentia*, the noun modified by the genitive, has its own adjective, *acrior*, and therefore the combination of the second adjective, *rapidi*, not with *potentia* but with the genitive *solis*, was almost inevitable.

[929]Compare E. 5.60–61 nec retia cervis ulla dolum meditantur, E. 6.23 ille dolum ridens, 1.684 falle dolo, 2.34 sive dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant, 2.390 dolus an virtus, 4.95 dolo divum, 5.342 ereptumque dolo . . . honorem, 8.206 scelerisve dolive, 11.712 vicisse dolo. With the possible exception of 6.29, cited in the same paragraph, *dolus* when used in the plural regularly has, as might be expected, an abstract meaning.

[930]C., too, employs the word "maze"; but he uses it as a rendering—also decidedly free—of *error* (591), not of *dolum*.

or a subjective genitive, as C. seems to. Also irrelevant to the present discussion is the question whether *minae* and *machina* are coordinated with *opera* or, as K.² says, in apposition with it (compare note 1044).

In 6.112–113 *maria* omnia . . . atque omnis *pelagi*que *minas caeli*que ferebat[931], we might substitute *pelagus minans caelumque* for *pelagi . . . minas caelique*.

In G. 4.267–268 tunsum *gallae* admiscere *saporem* arentisque *rosas*, the transfer of the adjective *tunsum* from *gallae* to *saporem* seems to prove that *gallae . . . saporem* is felt as a mere periphrasis[932] for the true parallel for *rosas, gallam*, plus some adjective meaning 'savory'.

Similar is G. 1.56–59 *croceos*[933] ut Tmolus *odores*, India mittit *ebur*, molles sua *tura* Sabaei, et Chalybes . . . *ferrum*, virosaque Pontus *castorea*, Eliadum *palmas* Epirus *equarum*[934]. Here *croceos . . . odores*, which = *odiferum crocum*, is used as a parallel for *ebur, tura, ferrum*, and *castorea*[935].

In 2.392 *galeam clipei*que *insigne* decorum, *insigne* seems more or less abstract, though the plural *insignia*, as in 389[936] just above, has assumed a concrete meaning. Doubtless *clipei . . . insigne = clipeum insigne*, as in 10.553 *loricam clipei*que ingens *onus* impedit, *clipei . . . onus = clipeum onerosum*.

Similarly in 10.496–497 rapiens immania *pondera baltei* impressum-

---

[931]Such a combination as *maria . . . atque . . . minas*, were *pelagique* and *caelique* omitted, would surely be classed by some as hendiadys (compare notes 598 and 863). But, as C. says, there are two ideas: that of sailing on every sea, and that of bearing all dangers (of wind and wave).

[932]Vergil's use of the periphrasis may have been partially induced by his desire to avoid the employment of a noun with two epithets, the adjective meaning 'savory' and the participle *tunsam*, which would then, of course, have been used directly with *gallam*, instead of being transferred as it actually is. (Compare notes 718, 928, and 995.) Similarly, some periphrases may be due to a desire on Vergil's part to avoid a piling up of appositives. Thus in G. 4.110–111 custos furum atque avium cum falce saligna Hellespontiaci servet tutela Priapi, after *custos* we should expect, not *tutela Priapi*, but *Priapus*, as P. says, or, to include both ideas present in the periphrasis, *tutor Priapus*, the equivalent suggested by Haverfield. But a poet might well desire to shun the succession of nominatives that would have resulted, *custos Hellespontiacus tutor Priapus*. Compare what was said above, 205, of the superiority of *animam . . . superbam ultoris Bruti* (in 6.817–818) to *animosum superbumque ultorem Brutum*. On a similar avoidance of a succession of genitives, see note 966.

[933]Compare note 867.

[934]This passage has been cited (192) in a different connection to illustrate another type of inconcinnity. It should be noted that it constitutes one of those catalogues in which, as was said in connection with its earlier citation, Vergil seems particularly eager to adopt devices that may insure variety, and thus prevent possible tedium.

[935]On the other hand *palmas . . . equarum* in 59 is more on the order of *croceos . . . odores*, though it is not so obvious and ordinary a periphrasis, representing as it does *equas quae palmis potiantur* or something of the sort.

[936]Verses 2.389–390 run thus: mutemus clipeos Danaumque insignia nobis aptemus. . . .

que *nefas*, *pondera baltei* = *ponderosum balteum*[937]. But *pondera baltei* as it stands is more suitable than its logical substitute as a parallel for *impressum . . . nefas*, which is likewise an abstract expression representing a concrete[938]—"the scene of horror stamped upon it", as N. puts it. Moreover, a change to *ponderosum balteum* would introduce an additional element of inconcinnity. The *impressum nefas* is only a part of the *ponderosus balteus*[939]—a very important part, however, since the belt really has *two* qualities which make it particularly valuable and attractive, its *weight* and its *embossing*[940]. Thus we see that, as has already been said, *pondera* (*baltei*) is really a better parallel for *nefas* than (*ponderosum*) *balteum*, though the latter, to be sure, would be an infinitely better object for *rapiens*. Of course the whole expression really means 'a heavy and engraved belt', and logically might run somewhat in this wise, *balteum ponderosum et*[941] *nefando*[942] *impressum*[943].

In 11.680–681 *oris hiatus* et *malae*, *oris hiatus* = *os hians*.

In 1.422 miratur *portas strepitum*que et *strata viarum*, *strata viarum*[944] = *stratas vias*—two words which in immediate succession are of course impossible in hexameter.

In 2.453 *limen* erat caecaeque *fores* et *pervius*[945] *usus*, *pervius usus* means 'a used[946] thoroughfare'[947]—a combination of two English words for both of which Latin, I believe, lacks equivalents[948].

---

[937]For *rapiens . . . pondera*, compare 5.407–408 pondus <caestuum> . . . versat.

[938]Compare on 2.412, page 199. [939]Compare note 1144, also note 915.

[940]Incidentally, it may be noted that the former is increased to some extent by the latter. As N. points out, *immania pondera* is accounted for by *multo . . . auro* in 499 quae Clonius Eurytides multo caelaverat auro. Embossing rather than engraving seems to be referred to here.

[941]The conjunction conceivably might be omitted.

[942]Neuter substantive: compare 1.543 deos memores fandi atque nefandi.

[943]Compare 5.536 cratera impressum signis.

[944]This expression, C. says, "as Madv. (§ 284, obs. 5) remarks, hovers between the partitive notion and that of quality". To my mind, this type of genitive partakes at least as much of the nature of the possessive, sometimes also of the appositional. (See further, with reference to the placing of this genitive in the category of quality and of apposition, notes 928 and 919, respectively.) This but goes to show the futility of attempts at exact classification of quaint and syntactically vague locutions of this kind. Compare note 33 and the other notes cited thereon. See, too, C. on G. 4.159. Here he refers to the same observation of Madvig's as on 1.422, but adds, "if indeed it is not better to say generally that the shades of meaning are nearly as various as in the other uses of the genitive after a substantive". This qualification of C's. seems to me thoroughly sound, and I think it a pity that Haverfield in his revision omits and ignores it. (Compare note 90.)

[945]Compare note 867. [946]Or perhaps 'usable'.

[947]Its literal sense, of course, is just an inversion of this—'thoroughfare use' (so F.-B.) or 'thoroughfare intimacy' (so K.).

[948]Compare note 921. The substantive *pervium* in Tacitus, Historiae 3.8 is, I think, less concrete than our use of 'thoroughfare' in English.

(8) Action

(a) Result of Action

It may be noted that, in the two examples just given, I have offered as an equivalent for the periphrasis (in English for the one, in Latin for the other) a noun plus a past participle. This might suggest that the periphrasis expressed not so much quality as action, or rather—since the participle is past, not present—the result of action[949]. But this is not the case, I think, for both those words—*used* and *stratas*—are in reality simply adjectives[950].

With these instances we may contrast an example in which the periphrasis really expresses result of action, namely 11.634–635 armaque corporaque et permixti *caede virorum* semianimes volvuntur *equi*. Here *caede virorum*[951] = *caesis viris*, an expression by no means identical in type with *stratas vias* just above, since the idea of action in *caesis* is much more prominent than it is in *stratas*. In passing, we must note that Vergil's *caede virorum* not only is productive of greater variety (*caesis viris* would involve a mere repetition of the idea already presented by *corpora*), but also is far more suggestive of the general state of confusion and ruin than the literal expression *caesis viris* would be. On this suggestiveness, compare note 485.

We may class here 2.562–563 subiit deserta *Creusa* et direpta *domus* et parvi *casus Iuli*. I cannot offer any cognate participle to correspond to *casus*: the best I can suggest as a substitute[952] is *Iulus*

[949]In regard to the example quoted just before these two, namely 11.680–681, as well as 4.88–89 and 6.112–113 (on 206–207), the same question may arise, to wit, whether the nouns involved—*hiatus*, *minae* and *minas*—are not *verbal* nouns, producing periphrases denoting action. Here again in each instance I have offered as the equivalent of the periphrasis not a noun plus an adjective but a noun plus a participle—a present participle this time—*hians*, *minantes*, *minans*. But these participles are little more than adjectives in their force, suggesting state rather than action; and I think the idea conveyed is decidedly that of quality. We may contrast with these examples those that undoubtedly denote action, 211–214.

[950]We have but to compare the effect conveyed by *stratas vias* with that conveyed by *stratis . . . iuvencis* in 3.247 (see 216) to be convinced of this. See note 695 for other instances of participles that have become simply adjectival in force.

[951]We may contrast *caede virorum* with *caede boum* in 3.247 (cited on 216). As is pointed out again in note 977, in that passage *caede* is literally and logically used, while the member coordinated with it, *stratis . . . iuvencis*, is not. On the contrary, in the instance under discussion here, it is *caede* with its attendant genitive that is not precisely used, and that must be changed if we wish perfect parallelism with the other term involved, *semianimes . . . equi*. It may be noted that this term is not exactly coordinated with *caede*, but it is certainly placed on a par with it by the use of *permixti*, which plays much the same part here as does *cum* in the passages commented on in note 627.

[952]Heyne paraphrases *casus Iuli* by *quid Iulo accidere possit*, which C. quotes. But that will not answer my purposes, for several reasons.

(1) The mood is open to question. I see no cogent reason for the use of an indirect question. I should prefer *quod Iulo accidere potest*.

(2) The tense, too, is open to question. Not action, but result of action, is

summa mala passus or something of the sort. Here as in the preceding example, the periphrasis in its very vagueness, which suggests so much more than it states, is far more effective than would be the precise combination of a noun and a participle. We know that Creusa *is* deserted. We know that Aeneas's home *may be* destroyed. But when we come to Iulus, Vergil leaves it to our imagination to decide what his plight is or may be. And this is made all the more ominous by the fact that the poet, with characteristic suggestiveness[953], has chosen to denote this plight a word that means not only 'occurrence' but 'calamity'[954].

---

involved here, as is indicated by the use of the *past* participles *deserta* and *direpta*. But the perfect tense is no more satisfactory than the present, for the calamity befalling Iulus may not yet be wholly completed as are the desertion of Creusa and (probably) the destruction of the house.

(3) The use of the modal auxiliary is not satisfactory throughout. Probably *quod Iulo accidere potuit* will do as a parallel for *direpta domus*, but *quod Iulo accidit* is demanded as a parallel for *deserta Creusa*: *deserta Creusa* represents a fact, *direpta domus* a possibility. (On the blending of the actual and the hypothetical in this passage, see 188.) Vergil's phrase, *casus Iuli*, in its very vagueness, fits equally well with both; and so should any paraphrase offered for it.

(4) The clause is really no more accurate than the phrase *casus Iuli* as a parallel for *deserta Creusa* and *direpta domus*. Like *casus Iuli* itself, it would be a much more precise parallel for *relictio Creusae* and *direptio domus*. (These hypothetical phrases are wholly un-Vergilian, and perhaps hardly Latin. Compare note 184.) It might, indeed, be said that these are the phrases that logic demands; that, in other words, *deserta* and *direpta* are participles of the '*ab urbe condita*' type. Then the example belongs below, 215–217. However, I doubt this, for it is much more vivid to say that Creusa herself comes to Aeneas's mind than that the fact of her desertion does. We may note the earlier periphrasis, *genitoris imago*, in 560, which is a pictorial substitute for *genitor*, and a possible parallel only for (*deserta*) *Creusa*, not for *relictio* (*Creusae*). On this periphrasis, see 197–198, also note 954.

[953]Compare note 605.

[954]Thus this periphrasis marks a great advance in impressiveness over its parallel in 560, *genitoris imago*. It may repay us to make a careful survey of the interrelations among the four subjects of *subiit—cari genitoris imago*, *deserta Creusa*, *direpta domus*, *parvi casus Iuli*. We may note several points that seem worthy of mention.

(1) The four terms are chiastically arranged, with a periphrasis at the beginning and the end, a noun modified by a participle in second and third places.

(2) There is a climax in uncertainty, and therefore in agony. We find mentioned first merely the *imago* of Anchises, naturally presented at the beginning, as suggested by the sight of Priam. It is true that the terrible fate of the aged king suggests the danger that the other old man may have suffered similarly; but there is no explicit reference to Anchises's condition. Next we hear of Creusa as *deserta*; this we already know to be the case. After her we hear of the house as *direpta*; this we do *not* know to be the case (compare note 953, third point), but we can well imagine it to be. Thus we have now entered the realm of surmise, so much more fearful than that of reality. Finally, the last detail is the most terrible of all, because here fact and precision are completely left behind; anything and everything may be possible; the imagination readily supplies details that the father of Ascanius, like the father of Icarus (6.32–33), can neither bear nor dare to give.

(3) On the other hand, while in the matter of surmise and suspense the order is climactic, from another point of view it is chiastic in stress as well as in syntax. That is, the extreme terms may be regarded as more important than

Casus is used definitely in the sense of 'calamity' in 1.221–222 *Amyci casum* gemit et crudelia secum *fata Lyci* fortemque *Gyan* fortemque *Cloanthum*. Here *casum*[955] retains its meaning to such an extent that perhaps we are hardly justified in viewing the phrase *Amyci casum* as a periphrasis.

(b) Action in Process

Likewise in instances in which the periphrasis expresses action in process, the verbal noun is generally quite appropriately and literally used, with its own distinct force. Therefore we may frequently do better to give genuine fusion as the reason for the lack of perfect parallelism than to employ the alternative explanation, that a mere periphrasis is used (compare what was said on 204 of 6.64–65).

Thus in G. 4.559–560 super *arvorum cultu pecorum*que canebam et super *arboribus* we might logically substitute either *super arvorum cultu pecorumque et arborum* or *super arvis pecoribusque et arboribus*. We may view *arvorum cultu* as roughly equivalent to *arvis colendis* or to *arvis cultis*, but neither of these phrases can be offered as a satisfactory substitute for it: *arvis colendis* is objectionable because of the rarity of the gerundive with *super* (compare G.-L., §433[956]); and *arvis cultis* is objectionable because of the inaccuracy of the tense of the participle. The difficulty is due to the fact that Latin possesses no present passive participle, and a present passive participle we need, present because the periphrasis expresses action in process[957], and passive because the genitives with *cultu* are objective.

---

the means. This, I think, is the norm in a series of terms chiastically arranged. It is natural that the mind dwells first and last on that which is of most moment. Compare, e. g., 10.524 per *patrios* manis et spes surgentis *Iuli*, where again the outside terms make us think specifically of Aeneas's most precious ones, his father and Iulus. There can be no doubt that Aeneas dearly loves his wife and his home, but equally there can be no doubt that the objects of his most sacred devotion are his father and his son.

(4) In each of the two periphrases, the genitive qualifying the abstract noun is itself qualified by an adjective—*cari*, *parvi*. Both the adjectives enhance the poignancy of the situation. They may in a sense balance the participles that modify the other two nouns, *deserta* and *direpta*; but these participles correspond rather to the words *crudeli vulnere . . . vitam exhalantem* (said of Priam, but implicitly applied to Anchises as representing at least a possible contingency, as has been mentioned in point 2 above), and *casus* (of Iulus). I am inclined to believe rather that Anchises and Iulus are dignified by adjectives because they are, as was just noted (point 3), the most important figures concerned.

[955]Note here, beside *Amyci casum*, the parallel phrase *fata Lyci*. With this we may compare *fata Sychaei* in 4.20, cited on 215–216.

[956]Horace, Carmen Saeculare 18–19 decreta super iugandis feminis, cited by Stolz-Schmalz[5], page 540, has too legalistic a sound to justify the construction.

[957]Not result of action, as in the previous section (209–211). Compare the use there of the *perfect* participle in the phrase *caesis viris*, offered as a substitute

With this example we may contrast G. 3.528 *frondibus* et *victu* pascuntur simplicis *herbae*. The genitive with *victu* is subjective, and accordingly we must propose an active participle in our substitute phrase. As in the preceding instance, it is difficult to find a participial equivalent for the verbal noun and its accompanying genitive; but this is simply because no cognate participle can be substituted for *victu*. Perhaps we may suggest *alente herba*. However, here again it seems simpler to treat the passage as an example of fusion, the fused elements being *frondibus et herba* and *frondium et victu herbae*.

The difference in effect produced by the use of subjective and of objective genitive, made clear by the comparison of the two foregoing passages, is even better illustrated by a very interesting example, 12.529–532 Murranum . . . praecipitem *scopulo* atque ingentis *turbine saxi* excutit effunditque solo. Here there exist two distinct possibilities[958]. (1) We may hold that *saxi* is an objective genitive, and the *turbo* is to be thought of as applied to the stone by the person who hurled it. Then, if we wish to supply a participial equivalent, we feel the need of a present passive participle, as in G. 4.559–560 (211); but perhaps a past passive participle might serve, as in 11.634–635 (209), since *turbine* in accordance with this interpretation may be viewed as expressing result of action rather than process. (2) Or we may hold that *saxi* is a subjective genitive, and the *turbo* is to be thought of as the natural motion of the stone. Then we need a present active participle, either reflexive or intransitive. Here again, as in the preceding passage, I am unable to offer a cognate participial equivalent for the verbal noun: the verb *turbo* does not correspond sufficiently well in meaning with the noun *turbo*. Perhaps *saxo torto* or *contorto* (on the analogy of 11.284 and 6.592–593, both

---

for *caede virorum* in 11.634 (209), as well as what is said of the need of a *perfect* tense in the clause proposed as a substitute for *casus Iuli* in 2.563 (note 952, point 2).

[958]Compare note 645. With regard to the type of genitive employed with *turbine*, Vergil's usage is not conclusive. Evidence in favor of the first view seems to be provided by 11.284 quo turbine torqueat hastam; and even more by 12.320 incertum qua pulsa manu, quo turbine adacta, especially if N. is correct in explaining *quo turbine* as standing for *cuius turbine*. On the other hand, in 9.91–92 neu turbine venti vincantur, the use of *venti* as a subjective genitive may suggest that *saxi* is employed in the same way; and 1.44–45 illum . . . turbine corripuit seems to me to involve only the thunderbolt's own movement, not anything imparted to it by Pallas. Not much help can be derived from the passage which most resembles ours, 6.592–594 pater omnipotens densa inter nubila telum contorsit, . . . praecipitemque immani turbine adegit. I should be inclined to interpret *turbine* here as meaning 'the whirling of the thunderbolt', making the understood *fulminis* objective; but N., following Henry, calls it "the whirl of the thunderbolt", and thus seems to make *fulminis* subjective.

quoted in note 958) will do if we accept the first alternative, *saxo volante* (on the analogy of 1.150 saxa volant) if we accept the second.

In most instances it is easy enough to find a present participle to correspond to the verbal noun that is accompanied by a subjective genitive.

Thus in G. 3.277–278 non, Eure, *tuos*, neque *solis* ad *ortus*, in *Borean Caurum*que[959], we could easily substitute *solem ad orientem* for *solis ad ortus*, though *te* (*orientem*) for *tuos* (*ortus*) would seem a little less natural.

Again in G. 3.407–408 nocturnum . . . *furem incursus*que *luporum* aut. . . *Hiberos*, we might change *incursus*. . . *luporum* to *incurrentes lupos*. Still, even here it seems better to recognize a fusion of *furem luposque aut Hiberos* and *furum incursusque luporum aut Hiberorum*.

Similar is G. 3.210 *Venerem* et caeci *stimulos* avertere *amoris*[960], where we may paraphrase *stimulos*. . . *amoris* by *stimulantem amorem*, or suggest a fusion of *Venerem et amorem* and *Veneris et stimulos amoris*. In either event the second member seems to present the repetition, under a more specific form, of the general notion involved in the first[961], quite in accordance with Vergil's love of parallelism[962].

The periphrasis is certainly to be stressed in 10.853 debueram *patriae* poenas *odiis*que meorum, and in 12.110 *socios* maestique *metum* solatur *Iuli*. Both these examples are highly effective. In the first, it may not be logical to speak of 'owing punishment to *hatred*'; but it is so impressive a manner of speech that the reader is

---

[959]This example is slightly different from the others here cited in two respects: (1) The periphrasis is not in precisely the same construction as the simple nouns. However, the difference is so slight, merely a shift from the preposition *ad* to the preposition *in*, that it seems negligible. (2) We cannot recognize an instance of fusion here, since, though we can substitute *Boreae Caurique ortus* for *Borean Caurumque*, and *te* for *tuos* (*ortus*), we can scarcely substitute *solem* for *solis ortus*. In other words, the periphrasis has considerable force of its own (compare note 891). The use of *ortus* is far more natural and necessary in connection with the sun than in connection with the winds, and perhaps Vergil would have employed *te* alone instead of *tuos* in the case of Eurus, thus treating Eurus as he does his brother-winds, had it not been for the close connection between the east wind and the (rising) sun.

[960]11.336–337 quem gloria Turni obliqua *invidia stimulis*que agitabat *amaris* is rather similar, with the adjective *amaris* corresponding to the genitive *amoris* (compare note 867).

[961]Unless we are to regard *Venerem* as used not so much of the driving motive-power of passion as of the actual physical union resulting from this passion. If it is used in the latter sense, it is still not quite parallel to *stimulos*, though it might be said to be parallel to the whole expression *stimulos* . . . *amoris*; but the passage certainly does not belong in the present discussion.

[962]For this reason, the passage helps to throw light on the phenomenon known as hendiadys, in the same way as the examples referred to in notes 598, 863, and 931. So, too, does 12.531 *scopulo* atque ingentis *turbine saxi* (already discussed, 212–213), where the genitive *saxi* is synonymous in root meaning with *scopulo*, just as in G. 3.210 the genitive *amoris* is with *Venerem*.

conscious of no lack of logic[963]. The second, on the other hand, could be explained in a perfectly straightforward and matter-of-fact way. It seems quite possible to talk of comforting, that is, soothing, Iulus's fear, just as it is to talk of assuaging cares in 4.528 (cited on 154). But that would be commonplace. Surely it is more to the point to interpret *metum . . . Iuli* as standing for *metuentem Iulum*. Then the passage presents a particularly striking instance of hypallage, bringing out well the difference between the state of mind of Aeneas's comrades and that of his young son: the former need consolation, of course, but they are not quite so desperate as the boy, who, so to speak, is all fear, and is therefore referred to not by his name *Iulum* but by the phrase *metum . . . Iuli*.

b. ONE MEMBER OF THE 'AB URBE CONDITA' TYPE

It is quite Vergilian to write *metum Iuli* for *Iulum metuentem*; but it is far more characteristic of Latin in general to write *Iulum metuentem* for *metum Iuli*. Latin loves to stress its participles—its present participles as in this instance, and even more its past participles[964], as in the familiar *ab urbe condita* of Livy, or *meta evitata* of Horace. A phrase of this sort is thrown into the concrete form so beloved of the Latin; but Vergil does not scruple to make such an expression parallel with a true abstract[965], just as, on the other hand, he does not scruple to make the abstract *metum . . . Iuli*, because its meaning is essentially concrete, parallel with the concrete *socios*.

---

[963]The defectiveness of the verb *odi* makes it impossible to follow our usual formula, which would demand that a phrase composed of the dative *meis* and a present participle be offered to serve as a complement for *debueram* and as a parallel for *patriae*. To be sure, the possibility exists that the demands of logic are satisfied so far as collocation goes by the passage as it stands, since *patriae* may be not a dative parallel to *odiis*, but a genitive parallel to *meorum*; but this seems most unlikely in view of the word-order (the natural flow of the thought is all in favor of taking *patriae* as a dative) and of the general Vergilian usage. There is also another possibility—also extremely remote—, that *odiis* is not a dative, but an ablative of cause; but then its copulation with *patriae* would seem to be doubly irregular; and we may safely dismiss this supposition.

[964]We have also one example with a future active participle in 4.307–308 (217), and one possible example with a future passive participle, that is, a gerundive, in 8.563–566. The latter passage is to be so classed if the first interpretation suggested in the note thereon (note 196) is, as I think it is, the correct one. Erulus was fortunate in the possession of three lives, and in the fact that arms had to be taken up against him three times. For the gerundive in the '*ab urbe condita*' construction, we may compare Livy, Praefatio 6 ante conditam condendamve urbem. On the use of the construction in general, see K.², Introduction, § 214.

[965]Many of the examples here cited will thus offer excellent examples of the combination of abstract and concrete (see 141–152), e. g., 3.555–556 (215), 3.247 216), 4.307–308 (217), 6.426–427 (217), 4.274–275 (note 987).

(1) Passive Participle

An example is 3.555–556 *gemitum* . . . pelagi *pulsata*que *saxa* audimus . . . *fractas*que . . . *voces*[966]. One can hear either *gemitum* or, in a certain sense, *saxa*[967]; but the true parallelism in thought lies between the verbal noun, *gemitum*, and the participial modifier of *saxa*, *pulsata*[968].

6.557–558 sonare *verbera*, tum *stridor* ferri *tractae*que *catenae*[969] is similar. We hear the whistling of the steel and the dragging of the chains[970].

Other examples are 8.131–133 mea me *virtus* et sancta *oracula* divum *cognati*que *patres*, tua terris didita[971] *fama*, coniunxere tibi; 7.365–366 quid *cura* antiqua tuorum et consanguineo totiens *data dextera*[972] Turno?; 6.817–818 vis et Tarquinios *reges animam*que[973] superbam ultoris Bruti *fascis*que videre *receptos*?; 10.12–13 cum fera Karthago Romanis arcibus olim *exitium* magnum atque *Alpis* immittet *apertas*[974]; 2.507–508 urbis . . . captae *casum*[975] *convulsa*que vidit *limina* . . . et *medium*[976] in penetralibus *hostem*; 4.20–21 post

---

[966]6.426–427 auditae *voces vagitus* et ingens infantumque *animae flentes* (to be discussed below, 217) is extremely similar. One may hear the *animae*; but it is really their *weeping—fletus animarum*—that is parallel with *voces* and *vagitus*. Perhaps one reason for avoiding the logical *infantum animarum fletus* is the piling up of genitives that it would involve (compare note 932). We can readily understand the Roman aversion to such piling up when we contemplate the unpleasant effect produced by the amazing succession of genitives in Caesar, De Bello Gallico 2.17.2 eorum dierum consuetudine itineris nostri exercitus perspecta. Normally, even a prose writer would have avoided a locution of this sort. In the same way a French stylist will not permit one phrase introduced by *de* to depend upon another. In this respect the English writer has more freedom than the Roman or the French, since he usually is at liberty to vary his sentence structure by a free choice between the possessive case and a phrase consisting of the preposition *of* and the objective.

[967]Compare the numerous examples of what I have suggested (note 791) calling a 'transferred verb'.

[968]Compare note 699.

[969]This example does not belong here if *tractae* . . . *catenae*, instead of being a nominative parallel to *stridor*, is a genitive parallel to *ferri*. However, the less logical combination seems by far the more Vergilian, and 11.863 teli stridorem aurasque sonantis (see 218) forms a perfect parallel; so I am inclined to follow C. and regard the words in question as more probably nominative.

[970]In thought, *stridor* balances *tractae* and *ferri* balances *catenae*. Compare 11.863 (217–218 and note 991).

[971]The second participle, *didita*, unlike the first, *cognati*, is apparently merely attributive.

[972]Compare 217, on 4.307–308, and note 984.

[973]On the secondary irregularity here, the illogical collocation of *reges* and *animam*, see 202 and 204-205.

[974]Compare C's. rendering (in his Translation): "fierce Carthage one day shall launch on the hills of Rome mighty ruin and the opening of Alpine barriers".

[975]Compare for the periphrasis with *casum* 1.221–222 and 2.562–563 (cited on 211 and 209, respectively).

[976]On the adjective see 218–220. For the general sense compare 9.549–550 (cited on 110).

fata Sychaei . . . et *sparsos* . . . caede *penatis*; 2.116 *sanguine* placastis ventos et *virgine caesa*; 3.247 pro *caede* boum *stratis*que *iuvencis*[977].

A kind of intermediary expression between the simple noun and the typical '*ab urbe condita*' type of expression is sometimes found in a dubious phrase[978] in which we may emphasize either noun or participle at will.

In 7.41–44 dicam horrida *bella*, dicam[979] *acies*, *actos*que animis in funera *reges*, Tyrrhenamque *manum*, totamque sub arma *coactam Hesperiam*, *actos*. . .*reges* is such a dubious phrase, since either *reges* alone (or with *actos* as a simple modifier) or *actos* reges (with the stress on *actos*)[980] would serve here. It thus affords a transition[981] from the simple nouns *bella*, *acies*, *manum*[982] to the typical '*ab urbe condita*' locution at the close, *coactam Hesperiam*. About the latter there can be no doubt, for Vergil certainly means that he is singing not of Hesperia merely—for that he is doing through his first six books also—but of *coacta* Hesperia.

Again in G. 2.161–162 an memorem *portus* Lucrinoque *addita claustra* atque *indignatum* . . . *aequor*, we note a sort of transition,

---

[977]We may compare with this passage 11.634–635 permixti caede virorum . . . equi (cited on 209). In either case the substitution of the concrete, participial form, *caesis bobus* here, *caesis viris* there, would result in perfect parallelism, but there is this difference: strict logic, at least from the English point of view, demands the abstract here, and the concrete there. In other words, in order to satisfy the demands of absolute rigor of thought, we should change the participial expression *stratis* . . . *iuvencis* in 3.247 to an abstract phrase such as *caede iuvencorum*, and the abstract phrase *caede virorum* in 11.634 to a participial expression such as *caesis viris*. (Compare note 951.) 11.729–730 inter caedes cedentiaque agmina Tarchon fertur equo seems to resemble 11.634–635 rather than 3.247; that is, *inter caedes* stands, I think, for *inter caesos*. Yet it may be that the general idea is, as in 3.247, abstract rather than concrete: *inter* is then used as in 5.151–152 elabitur . . . turbam inter fremitumque, and the general sense is that Tarchon advances in the midst of slaughter and of the retreat of battle-lines. Then *cedentia* . . . *agmina* is an '*ab urbe condita*' phrase (like those listed on 217–218), perhaps indicating the result of *caedes* (compare 175–179).

[978]Such dubiousness is quite in accord with Vergil's common lack of rigid definiteness in syntactic matters. Of course we should always remember that syntactic distinctions and definitions are stressed by us far more than they ever were by those who, using Latin as a living instrument, were only subconsciously cognizant of the exact category occupied by a given word or phrase. See note 33.

[979]'Connective repetition'; compare note 46.

[980]Compare the similar doubt in regard to E. 6.78 mutatos Terei narraverit artus (note 378).

[981]Compare the possibly similar rôle played by *raptas*. . .*Sabinas* in 8.635 (see 112).

[982]The most striking incongruity—that existing among the several objects of the second *dicam*—is done away with by H., since he uses only two commas (after *bella* and *reges*), thus apparently supporting what C. expressly denies, that *acies*, like *reges*, is to be taken with *actos*, and *manum*, like *Hesperiam*, with *coactam*.

from *portus* to *indignatum...aequor*, provided by *addita claustra*, which may or may not be an expression of the '*ab urbe condita*' type[983].

In 4.307–308 nec te noster *amor* nec te *data dextera*[984] quondam nec *moritura* tenet crudeli funere *Dido*, the noun with the past participle, *dextera*, is not nearly so indisputable an example of the '*ab urbe condita*' construction[985] as the one with the future participle, *Dido*. This is rather odd, for usually the passive participles lend themselves more effectively and emphatically to this construction than do the active ones[986]. For instance in G. 2.182–183 indicio est tractu *surgens oleaster* eodem plurimus et *strati* bacis . . . *agri*, we may be sure that the participle conveys the main idea in *strati bacis . . . agri*, but this statement does not necessarily apply to *surgens oleaster*, which is certainly of the intermediate type rather than a genuine '*ab urbe condita*' expression. As evidence of the truth of this last remark, we may note that *surgens*[987] might be omitted with no appreciable change of meaning[988].

(2) Active Participle

However, despite what was just said, we do find passages where the present participle is used in a genuine '*ab urbe condita*' expression. Two of these have already been referred to, 6.426–427 auditae *voces vagitus* et ingens infantumque *animae flentes*[989] and 11.863–864 teli

---

[983]Or are we to refer *addita*, or, rather, *additos*, supplied from it, to *portus* also? This seems less likely, since the port was not really added to Lake Lucrinus, but made out of it and Lake Avernus.

[984]Compare *data dextera* in 7.366 (215).

[985]Indeed, there is no need so to regard it.

[986]Compare 214.

[987]That *surgens* in this passage has somewhat more force than a mere descriptive adjective is, I think, proved by a comparison with a passage where it has not—4.274–275 *Ascanium surgentem* et *spes* heredis Iuli respice. Here of course the word *surgentem* adds much to the force of the injunction, with the contrast between the two generations, and the appeal to Aeneas's paternal pride and tenderness, that it tacitly implies; but none the less I think it is distinctly *Ascanius* pure and simple, not necessarily *Ascanius surgens*, for whom Aeneas is to take thought. Yet here, too, the noun thus modified by a participle is coupled with a phrase which it does not perfectly balance. We have once more the combination of abstract and concrete (compare note 965). There is a sort of chiasmus (on this see again note 997), for the modifier *surgentem* balances the object *spes*, and the object *Ascanium* balances the modifier *Iuli*. In the interests of perfect parallelism, *spes...Iuli* might be replaced by *sperantem Iulum*. But there is nothing illogical so far as thought goes in the expression as it stands, which is infinitely more picturesque and poetical. The abstract phrase is simply a variant, in the realm of the emotions, for the concrete, after Vergil's favorite manner. It, too, like 12.531 and G. 3.210 (213 and note 962), is of the stuff of which hendiadys is made.

[988]To be sure the case would be altered did we substitute for *strati bacis . . . agri* the expression which, by a common Vergilian hypallage, it represents, *stratae bacae* (*in agris*), a much more logical parallel for *surgens oleaster*.

[989]See note 966.

stridorem aurasque sonantis audiit[990]. The latter may be pointed out as a particularly good example of fusion—of *telum stridens aurasque sonantes* and *teli stridorem aurarumque sonitum*[991].

Similarly, 1.742 canit *errantem lunam* solisque *labores*[992] represents a fusion of *errantem lunam solemque laborantem* and *errores lunae solisque labores*.

5.655–656 inter *amorem* praesentis terrae fatisque *vocantia regna* represents a fusion of *amorem praesentis terrae vocatumque*[993] *regnorum*[994] and *amatam praesentem*[995] *terram fatisque vocantia regna*.

In 6.86–87 *bella*, horrida bella, et *Thybrim* multo *spumantem* sanguine cerno, *spumantem sanguine* is certainly a more distinctive epithet than *horrida*, and in it, rather than in *Thybrim*, is to be found the true *pendant* for *bella*. Compare 7.41–42[996].

In G. 1.422–423 hinc ille *avium concentus* in agris et *laetae pecudes* et *ovantes* gutture *corvi*, *concentus* is balanced so far as the thought is concerned not only by the participle *ovantes* with *corvi* ('the exultation of the crows'), but also by the adjective *laetae* with *pecudes* ('the happiness of the cattle').

(3) Adjective

Indeed, from the present participle to the adjective is but a step, and adjectives, like participles, not infrequently bear the main burden of the idea, which English naturally assigns to the substantive, as in the following examples.

In G. 2.471–473 illic *saltus* ac *lustra* ferarum, et *patiens* operum exiguoque *adsueta iuventus*, *sacra* deum, *sanctique patres*, we have an interesting alternation between the ordinary type of expression and the '*ab urbe condita*' type: the main thought is conveyed first by a group of two nouns, *saltus* and *lustra*; then by a group of two adjective phrases, *patiens operum* and *exiguo . . . adsueta*; then by a noun again, *sacra*; finally by an adjective again, *sancti*[997].

---

[990]See note 969.

[991]Here there is the same sort of balance as was observed in 4.274–275 (note 987), but the order is interlocked instead of chiastic. We find the interlocked order also in 6.558 (215 and note 970), 5.655–656 (218), and G. 2.473 (218 and note 997); the chiastic order in 1.742 (218).

[992]Contrast the thoroughly logical verse G. 2.478 *defectus solis* varios *lunae*que *labores*.

[993]Compare 12.95–96 o numquam frustrata *vocatus* hasta meos.

[994]It is hard to represent *fatis* in this version. Perhaps *fatalem* (agreeing with *vocatum*) would do.

[995]Of course a well-nigh impossible doubling of epithets. Compare notes 932 and 966.

[996]Page 216.

[997]The last two members seem especially closely connected: we may note that they are joined by *-que*, and of course we cannot fail to observe that they sum up

In 8.508–509 sed mihi tarda gelu saeclisque effeta *senectus* invidet imperium *seraeque* ad fortia *vires*, the idea of Evander's disabilities is brought out essentially by the noun *senectus* (incidentally by the adjectives which qualify it, *tarda* and *effeta*), and by the adjective *serae* (not at all by the noun which it qualifies, *vires*). The positive *senectus* and the neutral *vires* are far from being true parallels; *senectus* ought to be balanced by *debilitas*, *vires* by *aetas*[998].

In 10.71 Tyrrhenamque *fidem* aut *gentis* agitare *quietas*, the adjective *quietas* corresponds in force to the noun *fidem*[999]. Strictly logical would be *Tyrrhenam fidem aut gentium quietem* or *Tyrrhenos fidos aut gentis quietas*. Of course the words *gentis . . . quietas* may mean simply 'quiet peoples', but with *Tyrrhenam . . . fidem* it seems better to take them as meaning 'the quiet of the peoples'.

2.548–549 mea tristia *facta degenerem*que *Neoptolemum*[1000] narrare memento[1001] is on the same order. Here K. translates *degenerem . . . Neoptolemum* by 'the degeneracy of Neoptolemus'.

3.326–327 stirpis Achilleae *fastus iuvenem*que *superbum . . .* tulimus may be regarded as involving fusion of *stirpem Achilleam fastidiosam*[1002] *iuvenemque superbum* and *stirpis Achilleae fastus iuvenisque superbiam*, inasmuch as we may speak of enduring either the whims and the pride of a youth, or the capricious and haughty youth himself. In the same way, in E. 2.14–15 nonne fuit satius tristis Amaryllidis *iras* atque superba pati *fastidia*? nonne[1003] *Menalcan . . .*?, Corydon speaks first of enduring Amaryllis's wrath and scorn, then of enduring

---

the two great obligations of the *pius homo*. Grammatically, they present an illustration of chiasmus; but from the point of view of the thought, they are parallel in word-order, since the noun *sacra* corresponds to the adjective *sancti*, and the modifier *deum* to the modified *patres*. The order is, then, just the reverse of that noted in 4.274 *Ascanium surgentem* et *spes . . . Iuli*, where the order so far as grammar goes is *abab*, but so far as thought goes is *abba*. See note 987; and compare note 991.

[998]A close parallel to the combination of *senectus* and *vires* here is that of *health* and *age* in a despatch headed Philosophers Discuss Time, and signed by Robert Mountsier, which appeared on the first page of The Sun, September 14, 1926: "Dr. A. V. Vassilieff of the University of Moscow, whose *health* and *age* prevented his coming to the congress". Here *age* is used, as it generally is in such a connotation, to imply old age, a disability, in other words, in the sense of the Latin *senectus*, not *aetas*; that is perfectly natural. On the other hand *health* (which corresponds to *vires*) regularly implies strength, *good* health, just as *fortune* without a limiting adjective usually stands for *good* fortune. But in this sentence it must mean *poor* health, that is, it must indicate a disability, just as *age* does; and that is decidedly odd.

[999]If we accept N's. interpretation (which I think is correct), "to disturb the loyalty of the Tyrrhenes".

[1000]See also 244.

[1001]Note that in this expression *mea* and *Neoptolemum*, and in the following one *stirpis* and *iuvenem*, refer to the same person. Compare 4.274–275 (note 987).

[1002]See note 995.

[1003]'Connective repetition'; compare note 46.

Menalcas. Since the words following *Menalcan, quamvis ille niger* (essential for the contrast with *quamvis tu candidus*), are virtually equivalent to *nigrum*, we may say that this example is practically similar to the preceding one, representing a sort of fusion of *nonne Amaryllida iracundam atque fastidiosam...? nonne Menalcan nigrum?* and *nonne Amaryllidis iras atque fastidia...? nonne Menalcae nigrorem?*[1004]

Just as one may bear either a person or a manifestation of his personality, so one may fear either, as in 2.571–573 sibi *infestos* . . . *Teucros* et *poenas* Danaum et deserti coniugis *iras* praemetuens, where, from the point of view of logic, *infestos* seems to balance *poenas* and *iras* better than *Teucros* does. It is not absolutely necessary to take *infestos...Teucros* as an '*ab urbe condita*' phrase, but it seems pertinent to do so.

Exactly parallel to *infestos...Teucros* is *dominos...Teucros* in 10. 866 *iussa* aliena pati et *dominos* dignabere *Teucros*[1005], except for the fact that *dominos* is not an adjective but a noun. That is a mere detail; there is no essential difference between an attributive and an appositional modifier, or between a predicate adjective and a predicate noun[1006]. We may treat this example as we did the similar passages 3.326–327 and E. 2.14–15 just above[1007], and resolve it into the two elements that fused to form it, *iubentes alios et dominos* (i. e. *dominantes*) *Teucros* and *iussa aliena et dominatum Teucrum*[1008]. To be sure, there is also the possibility that *dominos* is the leading noun, exactly parallel to *iussa*, and *Teucros* a mere modifier, exactly parallel to *aliena*[1009]. The sense would then be 'to brook foreign orders and Trojan masters' (not 'the Trojans as masters'). This would involve a slighter inconcinnity of form, but a greater one of thought, and a loss of vigor as well.[1010]

[1004]However, C. believes that it is a question of Menalcas's scorn as well as of Amaryllis's, and that the reference to the former's complexion is introduced merely to anticipate any objection to him on the ground of personal appearance. In that case *Menalcan* stands for *Menalcae iras atque fastidia*.

[1005]Compare note 1001.

[1006]These '*ab urbe condita*' adjuncts are really predicative. Compare 112 on 3.180–181; also note 378. A perfect parallel with a participial '*ab urbe condita*' modifier is 7.421–422, provided that *fusos is* a participle and not part of an infinitive; but that seems to me highly doubtful (see note 421).

[1007]Pages 219–220.

[1008]We can readily see why neither of these was used. In the first, we find an unnatural construction, *iubentes* without an object clause, which seems harsh; and in the second, we find a very rare word, *dominatus*, which occurs nowhere in Vergil's authentic works.

[1009]In that event compare 4.537–538 Iliacas . . . *classis* atque ultima Teucrum *iussa* sequar? (cited in note 786).

[1010]Wagner takes *dominos* with *dignabere*, not with *pati* (compare 103). N. says, "It is not clear that he is right"; judging on the basis of Vergilian usage, I would go

2. EXAMPLES INVOLVING VERBS

We have just been considering examples of pairs of nouns in which the leading word of one member is coordinate in thought with a dependent word of the second member: usually a modifying genitive if that second member is a periphrasis[1011], or a modifying participle or adjective if that second member is a phrase of the '*ab urbe condita*' type[1012]. We now come to a type of inconcinnity involving verbs[1013] which is perhaps analogous, though more anomalous. This type is found in a few sentences in which occur a principal and a dependent verb-form (the latter a participle or an infinitive) either one of which is made coordinate with a third form to which the other presents a more logical parallel.

a. LOGICALLY INDEPENDENT FORM MADE PARALLEL TO DEPENDENT

(1) Infinitive

Thus in 8.515–517 sub te *tolerare* magistro militiam et grave Martis opus, tua *cernere* facta *adsuescat*, primis et te *miretur* ab annis, *cernere*, like *tolerare*, is made to depend on *adsuescat*, but logically it should be coordinate with *adsuescat* and with *miretur* instead of with *tolerare*, since it can hardly be desired that Pallas should *grow accustomed* to beholding Aeneas's exploits; indeed it seems as if that would rather blunt his admiration.

Again in G. 3.113–114 primus Erichthonius currus et quattuor *ausus iungere* equos rapidusque rotis *insistere* victor, *insistere* might perhaps better be parallel with *ausus* (*est*) than subordinate to it, since the real daring on the part of the pioneer lay in yoking his steeds to the chariot rather than in pressing on to victory.

Likewise in E. 5.29–31 Daphnis et Armenias curru *subiungere* tigris *instituit*, Daphnis thiasos *inducere* Bacchi et foliis lentas *intexere* mollibus hastas, if, as seems likely, C. is right in his statement

---

farther and say, "It is certain that he is wrong". A parallel for this employment of a direct object with *dignor*, in the sense apparently of 'deign to endure' (note how we need *pati*!), is not to be found in Vergil, who everywhere uses *dignor* either in the sense of 'deign' with an infinitive, as in this verse, or in the sense of 'deem worthy of' with an accusative and an ablative. Examples of the first usage are E. 6.1 dignata est ludere, 4.192 dignetur iungere, 10.732–733 est dignatus . . . sternere, 12.464 dignatur sternere; of the second E. 4.63 nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est, 1.335 haud . . . tali me dignor honore, 11.169 non alio digner te funere, and the corresponding passive 3.475 coniugio, Anchisa, Veneris dignate.

[1011]Pages 195–214. [1012]Pages 214–220. [1013]Compare note 604.

that *inducere* = 'introduce'[1014], the finite form *induxit*[1015] should have been used, since Daphnis did not *teach men* to *introduce* the rites of Bacchus, he himself *introduced* them. Here *instituit* probably means 'taught'[1016], as C. seems to think[1017]; but if its signification is rather 'began', this criticism still holds good, for then *inducere instituit*, 'began to introduce', is tautological[1018].

b. LOGICALLY DEPENDENT FORM MADE PARALLEL TO INDEPENDENT[1019]

(1) Infinitive

The reverse process is noticeable in 4.487–490 haec se carminibus *promittit solvere* mentes quas velit, ast aliis duras *immittere* curas, *sistere* aquam fluviis et *vertere* sidera retro, nocturnosque *movet* manis. Here instead of the finite verb *movet*, parallel to *promittit*, the infinitive *movere*, parallel to *solvere*, *immittere*, *sistere*, and *vertere*, would seem slightly more in place, since there does not seem to be any point in representing one special magical power of the witch as actually brought into effect, while the rest are merely potential[1020], the subject of her promises.

Another example of the same kind is 6.283–284 ulmus . . ., quam sedem Somnia vulgo . . . *tenere ferunt*, foliisque sub omnibus *haerent*, where, as has been pointed out above (note 246), *haerent* should, like

---

[1014]The expression that he uses in his Translation, "bring on", has a rather different connotation. Compare note 1017.

[1015]But the following *intexere* seems a perfect parallel for the preceding *subiungere*.

[1016]As it certainly does in G. 1.147–148 prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram instituit, and almost certainly does in E. 2.32–33 Pan primum calamos cera coniungere pluris instituit.

[1017]It is rather difficult to be sure of his view. His translation runs: "Daphnis, too, it was that set the fashion of harnessing the tigers of Armenia to the car; Daphnis, that showed how to bring on companies of Bacchanals, and twine quivering spear-shafts with soft foliage." Here "showed how" certainly = 'taught'; "set the fashion" rather partakes of the two meanings,' began' and 'taught', just as *instituit* perhaps does itself.

[1018]It is possible that *inducere* does not depend on *instituit* at all, but is an historical infinitive. (Compare 31–32 for the coordination of an indicative and an infinitive.) But it seems as if Vergil could not have failed to anticipate and prevent the awkwardness and ambiguity resulting from putting an independent infinitive between what are, apparently, two dependent ones. (For the second compare note 1015.)

[1019]We may compare with the examples listed here those referred to in note 244, which exhibit the coordination of verbs one of which should be subordinated to the other. See, too, what is said of 4.176–177 (82) and of 4.445–446 (171).

[1020]See 188–189 for examples in which the reverse situation prevails, that is, there is no differentiation between the actual and the merely potential.

tenere, be subordinated to *ferunt*, and should therefore be replaced by *haerere*[1021].

(2) Participle

In G. 3.438–439 ⟨anguis⟩ *volvitur*, aut catulos tectis aut ova *relinquens*, *arduus* ad solem, et linguis *micat* ore trisulcis, the main verb is out of place, since it describes a subordinate detail. This time it should be changed not to an infinitive but to a participle. That is, we should have not *micat* parallel to *volvitur*, but *micans* parallel to *relinquens* or to *arduus*. Both *arduus* and *micans* make the snake more formidable, the erect head and darting tongue being all ready to strike.

12.195–196 *sequitur* sic deinde Latinus *suspiciens* caelum, *tendit*que ad sidera dextram is an example of the same type: *tendit* is not logically parallel to the main verb *sequitur*, but describes a subordinate detail just as *suspiciens* does, and should therefore be replaced by *tendens*.

[1021]Though for other reasons, *haerentia*, as has been said (58), would be more appropriate still.

C. EXAMPLES INVOLVING TERMS NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE

1. ONE MEMBER INCLUDES THE OTHER LOGICALLY

Perhaps not wholly different from the uniting as coordinates of two expressions one of which is logically subordinate to the other[1022] is the uniting as coordinates of two entities one of which logically includes the other[1023]. The insertion of some such word as *alius* or *ceteri* is usually sufficient to remedy the lack of logic; but such insertion by Vergil himself is very rare[1024]. We do find it, for instance, in 3.211–212 dira *Celaeno Harpyiae*que . . . *aliae;* but for one such example we meet with a dozen like those that follow.

a. THE SECOND MEMBER INCLUDES THE FIRST

(1) Gods

In connection with G. 1.17–21 *Pan* . . ., adsis, . . . oleaeque *Minerva* inventrix . . ., et . . . *Silvane* . . ., *di*que *deae*que omnes, Servius

[1022]Compare especially note 1019.

[1023]As a rule the more important member comes second, so that an effect of climax is attained which would probably be weakened by the use of the more exact form demanded by strict logic. This more important member is sometimes, as in the first set of examples (224–225), the whole class, when the emphasis is on the more extensive; more often, as in the second set of examples (226–231), the special division, when the emphasis is on the more intensive.

[1024]An instance of such insertion where it seems scarcely necessary is E. 5.58 *silvas* et cetera *rura*. Haverfield objects to *cetera* as "feeble", although he retains C's. justification of it (borrowed from Wunderlich) on the ground that *rus* includes pastures. But I wonder whether pastures are really designated by *silvas* here. It is true that to the Italian there is doubtless a very close connection between pastures and woods (see C's. note on E. 1.2). Thus the writer, whoever he was, of the disputed opening of the Aeneid, used *silvis* to stand for the Eclogues just as he used *arva* to stand for the Georgics; and, to quote examples nearer at hand and therefore more pertinent, *silvestrem* . . . *musam* in E. 1.2 and *silvas* in E. 4.3 likewise represent the field of pastoral poetry in general, while *silvis* in E. 5.43 Daphnis ego in silvis would seem more applicable to pastures (note *pecoris* in the following line), though P. takes it as referring to woods. But *silvae* in E. 5.28 montesque feri silvaeque loquuntur would seem far more impressive in the strict sense of 'woods'; and, since it is to that passage that E. 5.58 corresponds more closely, I believe that *silvas* in the latter verse also is most effectively, as well as most naturally, viewed as meaning 'woods'. We may remark the reference to lions just before E. 5.28, and that to Dryads just after E. 5.58 (the arrangement in E. 5.58–59 is chiastic, I think: in E. 5.59 the words before the verb, *Panaque pastoresque*, seem to correspond rather closely with *cetera rura*, and those after the verbs, *Dryadasque puellas*, with *silvas*). Thus the use of *silvas* here does not seem to me to suggest pastures. However, woods as well as pastures may of course be considered part of the country. If they could not, we should have an example of the same type as 6.411–413 inde *alias animas* . . . deturbat . . . ; simul accipit alveo ingentem *Aenean*, an example of "the Greek and Latin idiom of including a person or thing among those from whom it is intended to distinguish him", as C. puts it in his note on the latter passage. Another possible example is 9.224–227 *cetera* . . . *animalia* somno laxabant curas . . . : *ductores* Teucrum . . . consilium . . . habebant. This is a comparable instance if *animalia* do not include man; but Vergil's usage does not seem conclusive. For further illustrations of the idiom, compare Lucretius 1.114–116 and Livy 4.41.8, and see Munro's note on the former passage.

explains that the poet, for fear of omitting some deity, follows the custom of the pontiffs, who, after addressing particular gods, conclude with a general invocation. This coupling of the general with the particular is, then, very natural where divinities are concerned[1025]. It occurs again in 3.19 *Dionaeae matri divis*que, for which Wagner cites as a parallel the Greek ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί. Very like 3.19 is 8.103 *Amphitryoniadae*[1026] magno *divis*que.

(2) Persons

In 2.394 *Dymas* omnisque *iuventus*[1027], supply *cetera*.

In 11.170 pius *Aeneas* et . . . magni *Phryges*, supply *ceteri*.

In 12.446–447 vidit . . . *Turnus*, videre[1028] *Ausonii*, supply *ceteri*[1029]. With this we may compare 10.267–268 *Rutulo regi ducibus*que ea mira videri *Ausoniis*, in which *ceteris* is to be supplied with *ducibus . . . Ausoniis*.

(3) Places

In 7.54–55 e *Latio* totaque . . . *Ausonia*[1030], supply *cetera*.

In 3.125–127 *Naxum* viridemque *Donusam*, *Olearum* niveamque *Parum* sparsasque . . . *Cyclades*, supply *alias*.

(4) Things

In 5.410 *caestus* ipsius et Herculis *arma*, supply *alia*[1031].

In 2.467–468 nec *saxa* nec *ullum telorum . . . genus*, supply *aliud*[1032].

In 11.790–791 non *exuvias* pulsaeve *tropaeum* virginis aut *spolia* ulla peto, supply *alia*.

[1025]Compare the examples on 226–228; also 9.209, cited on 92.

[1026]There can, of course, be no doubt as to whether Amphitryoniades—i. e. Hercules—counts as a god here. Note the term applied to him in the same connection, in 8.201 adventumque *dei*.

[1027]Compare 12.399 (228).

[1028]'Connective variant repetition'; compare note 225, on 7.742–743, and note 912, on G. 1.77–78.

[1029]There can be no question of any distinction between the Rutulians and the Ausonians. *Ausonii* is without doubt a generic term including all Italians. If proof is needed that Turnus as a Rutulian is an Ausonian, we may offer 11.41 cuspidis Ausoniae of the weapon that killed Pallas, or—still more conclusive evidence—12.183 Ausonio . . . Turno.

[1030]Compare 1.2–3 and 1.13–14 (231). 3.170–171 *Corythum terras*que . . . *Ausonias* is similar to 7.54–55 if, as C. thinks, *Corythum* stands here for the specific Etruscan city of Corythus. But if, as K. appears to believe (see his Vocabulary), it, like *Ausonias . . . terras* (compare note 1029), stands by metonymy for the whole of Italy, we have mere parallelism. Still another possibility is that *Corythum* indicates not a place but a person; then the passage belongs above (192).

[1031]We might perhaps take one noun in apposition with the other, interpreting *et* as 'even' with the genitive *ipsius . . . Herculis*; but this seems scarcely likely, especially since neither *caestus* nor *arma* would have sufficient force without the limiting genitive.

[1032]Unless a *saxum* is not to be classed as a *telum*.

b. THE FIRST MEMBER INCLUDES THE SECOND

In the above examples, the connective (usually *-que*) is practically equivalent to some such English expression as 'and in fact'. Thus 7.54–55[1033] might be paraphrased by 'from Latium and, indeed, the whole of Ausonia'. We find a still commoner usage where *-que* means rather 'and especially' or 'including'; that is, the larger group stands first, and it is with the earlier member that *alius* or *ceteri* logically belongs[1034]. See K's. Introduction, K.[1] § 198, K.[2] § 218. The first example cited there, 1.2–3 *Italiam . . . Lavinia*que *. . . litora*, provides an excellent contrast with 7.54–55 e *Latio* totaque . . . *Ausonia*[1035] in illustration of this second use of *-que*.

(1) Gods

A notably large proportion of examples refer to the gods[1036].

We may note first 3.222–223 *divos* ipsumque . . . *Iovem*, 8.572–573 vos, o *superi*, et divum tu maxime rector *Iuppiter*, 12.895 *di* me terrent et *Iuppiter* hostis. In the first of these *ipsum*[1037], and in the second *maxime* and *rector*, particularly the former[1038], serve to set Jupiter apart from the rank and file of the gods.

In 4.45 *dis* . . . auspicibus . . . et *Iunone* secunda, it is Juno who is singled out, for two reasons, as C. says: "as the patroness of Carthage and as the goddess of marriage".

I feel safe in classing here G. 1.498 *di patrii*, *Indigetes*, et *Romule Vesta*que mater, even though I am far from certain as to the precise relationship to each other of the two groups heading the list. C. says that the *di patrii* and the *Indigetes* were not the same; Haverfield on the other hand defines the *Indigetes* as "national or indigenous deities"[1039], and in this sense it would seem that the *di patrii* were either coextensive with them, or at least inclusive of them. P. re-

---

[1033]See 225.

[1034]Compare note 1023.

[1035]For these two passages, see 231 and 225, respectively.

[1036]Compare what has been said (224–225) of G. 1.17–21, 3.19, and 8.103.

[1037]Compare 9.811–812 (228).

[1038]Compare the comment on page 228 in regard to the adjective modifiers in 1.30, 9.811–812, 4.140, 12.399, 8.330, 1.612.

[1039]This is the view of Wissowa, who maintains, in Pauly-Wissowa, 9.1334, that the term *Di Indigetes* means the same as *di indigenae*, and never has any other sense in the living speech of the Romans. It is to be observed that in the singular *Indiges* seems to refer especially to Jupiter or to Aeneas (compare 12.794 Indigetem Aenean scis). Wissowa explains (*ib.*, 1333) that Aeneas became identified with *pater indiges* at about the same time as Romulus became identified with Quirinus.

gards Romulus as belonging to the *Indigetes*[1040], and Vesta to the *di patrii*[1041]. If this is correct, then we must assume that to Vergil, at all events, as to Servius, the Indigetes properly were deified heroes, "dii ex hominibus facti"[1042]. But the Romans in general seem not to have reached any fixed conclusion as to just who the *Indigetes* were, nor have modern scholars been more successful; and I do not propose to attempt here a discussion of this most vexed question.

G. 1.338–339 venerare *deos*, atque . . . sacra refer *Cereri* may be classed here, since *sacra refer* virtually repeats *venerare*[1043].

4.510–511 ter centum tonat ore *deos*, *Erebum*que *Chaos*que tergeminamque *Hecaten* seems to mean 'he calls on three hundred gods, including Erebus, Chaos, and three-formed Hecate'[1044]. It might be urged here that Erebus and Chaos are not properly to be classed as gods[1045], but Hecate certainly is. A corresponding question can be raised in connection with 6.264–265 *di* quibus imperium est animarum, umbraeque silentes et *Chaos* et *Phlegethon*, which is very similar[1046].

[1040]In Livy 8.9.6, Quirinus seems not to be included among the *Di Indigetes*, since the list includes first five individual deities (Janus, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, Bellona), and then five groups (Lares, Divi Novensiles, Di Indigetes, Divi, Di Manes)—all independent of one another and mutually exclusive, I think.

[1041]C. declares that in the similar passage in Ovid (Metamorphoses 15.861–867) the *Di Aeneae comites* include Vesta, and the *Di Indigetes* include Quirinus; but Ovid's grouping is not so distinct as that, indeed, is not any more distinct than Vergil's. Ovid's invocation is addressed to the following: Di Aeneae comites, Di Indigetes, Quirinus, Gradivus, Vesta, Phoebus, Jupiter. If we are to assume that Ovid is following the same chiastic arrangement as Vergil, we shall have to place Gradivus as well as Quirinus with the *Di Indigetes*, which will at once force us to conclude that for Ovid the group included gods as well as demigods, whatever it meant to Vergil; and we shall have to place Phoebus as well as Vesta with the *comites Aeneae*, which is certainly not correct. Jupiter, perhaps, may be left out of either category, as being in a class by himself, without anything like him or second to him, as Horace has it (Carmina 1.12.18). But the difficulty in locating Gradivus or Phoebus suggests how dangerous it is to assign a special place to Romulus or to Vesta.

[1042]Apparently this is not the view of Livy, who lists *Di Indigetes* and *Divi* side by side (see note 1040), and perhaps not of Ovid (see note 1041). Horace, Carmina 1.2, which C. calls an imitation of Vergil's passage, has no bearing whatsoever on this phase of the question, and indeed has but little in common with the Vergilian passage, apart from containing an appeal to the gods of Rome for aid.

[1043]Compare note 833 on 2.310–312, and page 200 on 12.328–329.

[1044]There is also the possibility, as in 12.176–181 (34), 2.591–592 (138), 4.88–89 (206–207), 1.612 (note 1052), and 3.90–92 (note 1073), that the first conjunction is not connective but merely correlative. In that case we get an example of partitive apposition (note *ter centum*). On this compare notes 1052 and 1073.

[1045]If they are rather to be regarded as places, compare 190–193, especially 190 on 12.197–199.

[1046]Here *que . . . et . . . et* may be simply correlative, like *-que . . . -que . . . -que* in the preceding example (see note 1044). But this is even more doubtful, since the relative clause *quibus . . . animarum* scarcely applies to Chaos and Phlegethon, even if, as is hardly likely, they be looked upon as *di*. Moreover, the interpolation of *umbraeque silentes* is an almost decisive factor in opposition to this interpretation.

Further examples are 5.240 Nereidum Phorcique *chorus*[1047] *Panopea*que virgo[1048], and 8.698 *deum monstra*[1049] et latrator *Anubis*.

(2) Persons

The paired words may refer also to a group of men (their nationality, office, etc.) and to a particular member of the group[1050].

Examples are 1.30 *Danaum* atque immitis *Achilli*; 9.811–812 *Troes* et ipse[1051] fulmineus *Mnestheus*; 4.140 *Phrygii comites* et laetus *Iulus*; 12.399 *iuvenum* et maerentis *Iuli*; 8.330 *reges* asperque . . . Thybris; 1.611–612 Ilionea petit dextra laevaque Serestum, post *alios*, fortemque *Gyan* fortemque *Cloanthum*[1052].

In the preceding examples, it should be noted how the individual selected for special mention outside the group to which he belongs is in each instance especially distinguished by some qualifying adjective[1053]—*immitis*, *fulmineus*, *laetus*, *maerentis*, *asper*, and *fortem*[1054], respectively.

[1047]We may compare 5.823 Glauci *chorus* Inousque *Palaemon* (cited on 199), which differs from this example only in that the individual Palaemon is *not*, I think, a member of the group (*chorus*) represented by the term with which his name is coordinated.

[1048]But Heyne would separate *Panopea . . . virgo* from *Nereidum Phorcique chorus* (the subject of *audiit* in 239) and combine it with *et pater . . . Portunus* (the subject of *impulit* in 242).

[1049]On *deum monstra* in the sense of *di monstruosi*, see 197.

[1050]Compare 2.394 (225).

[1051]For *ipse*, compare 3.222–223 (226).

[1052]C. explains *fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum* as epexegetical of *alios*, but certainly Gyas and Cloanthus did *not* compose the whole group designated by *alios*. Compare 510–511 above, Anthea Sergestumque videt fortemque Cloanthum Teucrorumque alios. Here Brunck holds that Sergestus is the same as the Serestus of 611, but C. concludes that he is not; see his note on 1.611, and compare 4.288 = 12.561 Mnesthea Sergestumque vocat fortemque Serestum. But even if Brunck is right, there is still mention of an additional person, Antheus—not to speak of the unspecified 'others' of the following verse. Moreover, 1.518 cunctis nam lecti navibus ibant probably means that the envoys were sent from *each* ship (see C's. discussion, and compare, with him, the distributive use of *cunctus* in G. 2.42 and 3.398), so that there would have been at least twelve. Most likely we are to imagine that Aeneas now has the pleasure of seeing once more all those that he had mourned as lost (1.220–222 nunc . . . Oronti, nunc Amyci casum gemit et . . . fata Lyci fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum) except of course Orontes (compare 1.113–117). The group would then include, besides Gyas and Cloanthus, Amycus and Lycus (or is Lycus a companion of Orontes?—compare 1.113 quae *Lycios* fidumque vehebat Oronten) and various others. But we may well suppose that Vergil, here as elsewhere, elected to spare us a tiresome long list, suggesting numbers by a few typical names, chosen in accord with his usual love of variety (which led him even to change the material of the wooden horse!): note the diversity in the passages mentioned here, and others, e. g. 1.181–183 Anthea si quem . . . videat . . . aut Capyn aut . . . arma Caici. (On Vergil's love of variety, see note 358.)

Thus if the first *-que* is not connective, we have an example of partitive apposition here, as we have under similar conditions in 4.510–511 (see note 1044), 6.264–265 (see note 1046), and 3.90–92 (see note 1073).

[1053]Compare 226, on 8.572–573.

[1054]But *fortem* does not give quite the effect of special distinction that the other adjectives do. It is practically a stock epithet. Note *fortemque Gyan fortemque*

8.281 *sacerdotes* primusque *Potitius* may be explained as involving a fusion of *sacerdotes, primo Potitio*[1055] (ablative absolute) and *primus Potitius, deinde alii sacerdotes*. We may compare *primumque* in 3.58 ad *proceres* primumque *parentem* and in 5.746 *socios* primumque . . . *Acesten*[1056], also *et . . . prima* in 5.340–341 totum . . . *consessum* . . . et *ora*[1057] prima *patrum*. This use of *primus* is somewhat like that of *ipse* in 9.811–812[1058], in that it emphasizes the member in which it occurs.

Similar in its force to *primus* in the preceding examples is *pauci* in 6.743–744 per amplum *mittimur* Elysium, et *pauci* laeta arva *tenemus*, since to be among the few who are chosen out of the many who are called constitutes a distinction quite like that of being the first of a group. Indeed, the whole passage of which the words just cited are a part, namely, 6.743–744 quisque suos *patimur* manis; exinde per amplum *mittimur* Elysium, et pauci laeta arva *tenemus*[1059], provides an instance of verb usage[1060] precisely parallel to the employment of the nouns in the passages cited above (228–229). To my mind, the classes of persons indicated by the three verbs in the first person are neither identical nor mutually exclusive: the first, represented by *patimur*, is the largest; the second, represented by *mittimur*, is a part of the first; and the third, represented by *tenemus*, is a part of the second. C. says, "A doubt still remains whether 'mittimur' refers

---

Cloanthum in 1.222, *fortemque Cloanthum* in 1.510 (both these passages are treated at greater length in note 1052). See note 808 for another reference to the comparative weakness of a stock epithet. Moreover, in the present instance, the repetition of *fortem* with each of the two nouns used conveys the impression that it is meant to apply to every member of the group, especially in view of the fact that Gyas and Cloanthus are merely typical members of this group (once more compare note 1052), not outstanding figures like Achilles, greatest warrior among the Greeks, or Iulus, preeminent alike in his boyish glee at the hunt (4.140) and in his filial sorrow over the wounding of Aeneas (12.399). On the other hand, we may see pathos in the repetition of *fortem* in 1.222, as does Professor Knapp (see his Introduction, K.[1] § 265, K.[2] § 300).

[1055]Or, if the Latinity of this is deemed open to question (compare notes 184 and 189), *Potitio duce*, or *Potitio ducente*, or *Potitio praeeunte*. For the first of these variants, compare E. 4.13, 6.59, 10.92, 12.260, perhaps 1.696; for the second, 2.632; for the third (a less close parallel), 5.186.

[1056]However, it is not quite certain that the second member in these two examples belongs to the class indicated by the first. If it does not, the passage does not belong here, but illustrates the figure '*hysteron proteron*'.

[1057]Here *ora . . . patrum* is viewed as a periphrasis for *patres*. Compare the examples cited on 199. For another treatment of this line, see 238.

[1058]See 228 and note 1051.

[1059]I am here adopting the simplest and most non-committal method of punctuation. For a proposed system of pointing of my own, with a detailed discussion of these two verses and of the passage in which they occur, I may refer to The Classical Weekly 20.215–219.

[1060]Compare note 604. Perhaps we may add another example involving verbs, 3.561–562 haud minus ac iussi faciunt, *primus*que . . . contorsit . . . proram Palinurus. Note once more *primus*—already commented on above (25).

to the whole body of the departed, as 'patimur' evidently does, or to the few spoken of in the next clause." I should say to neither, but to a group intermediate between the two. The idea that I am expressing here Henry seems at first to hold, for he says (3.397) that every one is treated according to his own circumstances, the purification being little more than a matter of form in the case of the very exalted spirits: and then these spirits "are despatched off-hand to wide Elysium, where a few . . . (PAUCI) remain permanently, while the greater number are sent back again, as you see yonder, to life". But later on (402) he specifically rejects this view, saying, "all the purified souls after a thousand years' residence in Elysium are alike brought down to Lethe and alike re-ascend to earth"; and (401–402) he specially warns the reader *not* to think that there are two categories of souls, those who remain and those who return. Norden and Butler[1061], on the other hand, recognize precisely these two categories, and emphasize the fact of their existence. According to them, one of these categories includes those that return to earth (the great majority); and the other, those that remain in Elysium (the chosen few)[1062]. Norden (19) states this division as follows: "a) Wenige (die Besten) bleiben dauernd im Elysium. . . . b) Die meisten Seelen bleiben in einem an das Elysium angrenzenden Talkessel . . ., wo sie in der am Elysium vorbeifliessenden Lethe . . . Vergessenheit trinken. . . ." For Butler's paraphrase of this view, which he adopts without question, see page 8 of his Introduction and page 229 of his Commentary. K.[2] also shares this view: he says that *pauci . . . tenemus* (744) and *has omnis . . . reverti* (748–751) are "sharply contrasted with each other". I would outline the entire division of souls as follows:

*ei qui patiuntur manis = omnes animae (743)
1. ei qui exercentur poenis (739)
2. *ei qui per Elysium mittuntur (744)
   a. *ei qui laeta arva tenent = pauci (744)
   b. ei qui (postquam longa dies exemit labem) in corpora revertuntur (751) = hae omnes (748)

[1061]Eduard Norden, P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI[2] (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1916), and H. E. Butler, The Sixth Book of the Aeneid, With Introduction and Notes (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1920). I was not familiar with either of these authorities when first I developed my own views on the matter; but I find myself much nearer to being in accord with them than with any of the commentators whom I had consulted. Indeed, it was my sense of dissatisfaction with the explanations given by these older commentators that led me to try to work out one of my own—which I might never have tried, or dared, to do, had I first read Norden's ingenious and interesting interpretation. As it is, my principal point of disagreement with this interpretation is indicated in note 1062.

[1062]But these chosen few, according to them, do *not* remain in Elysium eternally, but, after being purified there, depart to be merged into the *anima mundi*.

When starred, *ei* includes Anchises. Hence for the groups so designated the first person is used by Vergil.

(3) Places

We find names of places as well as of people used in the manner here under discussion[1063], as in 1.2–3 *Italiam . . . Lavinia*que . . . *litora*, 1.13–14 *Italiam . . . Tiberina*que . . . *ostia*.

(4) Things

Miscellaneous examples are 8.220–221 *arma* . . . nodisque gravatum *robur*[1064], 3.649 *bacas* lapidosaque[1065] *corna*, E. 6.33–34 *exordia* [1066]. . . . *omnia* et ipse[1067] tener mundi . . . *orbis*[1068], perhaps 3.90–91 *omnia* . . . *limina*que *laurus*que[1069], E. 9.51 *omnia* fert aetas, *animum* quoque[1070].

2. ONE MEMBER INCLUDES THE OTHER PHYSICALLY

a. PLACE AND ITS OCCUPANT

We have many examples of a different type in which one member ncludes the other, not because it denotes a class to which the other belongs, but because it denotes a place wherein the other is contained; that is, the second is a part of the first not logically, but physically.

(1) Occupant a Thing

A number of examples may be cited to illustrate this coupling of terms denoting respectively a place and something to be found therein or thereon.

One very striking passage is 2.250–252 nox involvens . . . *terram*que *polum*que Myrmidonumque *dolos*[1071]. How illogical, and at the same time how effective, this is! Somewhat the same effect of vigor, with an element of the unexpected at the close, I get in this remark of the delicately ironical E. M. Forster[1072]: "The Copts still believe, with

[1063]Compare 7.54–55 and 3.125–127 (225).

[1064]Compare 5.410 and 2.467–468 (225). This example belongs here if, as C. suggests, Hercules's arms include a bow and arrow as well as a club; otherwise it is simply an instance of parallelism.

[1065]See note 1038.

[1066]Or simply *ordia*, according to N's. conjecture, recorded by Haverfield, which makes *ex* a separate word governing *his* (preceding *ex*) *primis* (following *ordia*).

[1067]Compare 9.811–812 (228 and note 1051).

[1068]P. compares τά τε ἄλλα πάντα καὶ αὐτός.

[1069]See note 1073.

[1070]Compare 11.509–510 est omnia quando iste animus supra.

[1071]There is a double breach of logic here. Therefore, the example has already been listed in another category (206). The more irregular the coupling of *dolos* with *terram* and *polum* is, the more striking it is.

[1072]In Pharos and Pharillon, 66 (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1923). On this passage see again below, note 1108.

Timothy the Cat, in the single Nature of Christ; the double Nature, upheld by Timothy Whitebonnet, is still maintained by *the rest of Christendom* and by *the reader*" (the italics are mine, of course).

Other examples are 10.3–4 *terras* . . . omnis[1073] *castra*que Dardanidum aspectat ⟨Iuppiter⟩ populosque Latinos[1074], G. 4.202 *aulas*que et cerea *regna* refigunt, 3.149 ab *Troia* mediisque ex *ignibus* urbis, G. 3.216 nec *nemorum* patitur meminisse nec *herbae*[1075], G. 3.314–315 pascuntur . . . *silvas* et *summa* Lycaei, horrentisque *rubos* et amantis ardua *dumos*[1076], 11.477 ad *templum* summasque ad Palladis *arces*,

---

[1073]N. compares 3.90–92 tremere *omnia* visa repente *limina*que *laurus*que dei, totusque moveri mons (already cited on 231). However, concerning the interpretation of this passage there exist two other possibilities. (1) The words *liminaque laurusque* may be not parallel with *omnia*, but in a sort of partitive apposition with it. Such apposition is also an example of non-parallelism, but of a slightly different type; compare note 873. See the examples of part-whole apposition cited on 201–202, also what is said of 5.734 on 235–236; and for other passages where the same doubt arises as in the present one, see note 1044 on 4.510–511 and note 1046 on 6.264–265. C. and H. seem to take the first *-que* in 3.91 as correlative rather than copulative, since they place a comma before *liminaque laurusque*. (2) It also is possible that the words *liminaque laurusque* do not belong with *omnia* at all, since they may be the subjects not of the preceding verb *tremere* . . . *visa*, but of the following one *movere* (*visa*).—However, N. may, of course, be right, and in that case this example may be compared with E. 6.33–34, for which see 231.

Another example about which much the same doubt arises is 6.43 quo lati ducunt *aditus* centum, *ostia* centum. Since there is no connective, *ostia* may be in apposition with *aditus*: but on the other hand, since the repetition of *centum* may well replace a connective (see note 46), the two nouns may be coordinate with each other. In either case the *ostia centum* seem to me to form a part of the *aditus centum*. K. makes the two nouns practically equivalent, considering this an instance of parallelism. Henry, who gives a lengthy and elaborate discussion, takes *aditus* as an abstract noun of action; and C. follows him, giving as a paraphrase, "aditus per centum lata ostia".

Rather similar in movement is 5.85 septem ingens *gyros*, septena *volumina* traxit. Here again, as in 3.90–92, three views may be offered. (1) The nouns may be completely parallel: so C., who says *gyros* and *volumina* are probably the same. (2) One noun may logically be subordinate to the other: so Wagner, who paraphrases by *septem gyros in se replicatos*. This, as C. says, involves "a sort of hendiadys"—always, to my mind, a dubious method of explanation when carried out in the orthodox manner (see note 3). (3) The two nouns may be in the relation of whole and part, or at least in that of whole and quality: so K., who says that "*gyros* pictures the coils proper, *volumina* the dimensions of each coil"; and so, in a sense, Henry, who takes *gyros* of the snake's circuits around the tomb and *volumina* of its coils, seven to each *gyrus*, as N. says. The last explanation seems to me the best, as being the only one that would justify the distinction between the cardinal *septem* and the distributive *septena* (a distinction which, however, is not fully maintained in 5.560 or 10.329–330). As it happens, it is at the same time the best parallel for the interpretation of 6.43 that I have just indicated as mine.

[1074]On this last member, see 234.

[1075]This might be taken by some as hendiadys, meaning 'the groves of grass', or 'the grass in the groves'. But there are really two distinct ideas, the familiar locale and the regular food. With the coordination of *nemorum* and *herbae* here, we may compare the coordination of *silvis* and *frondi* in G. 2.323 ver adeo frondi nemorum, ver utile silvis; but it must be noted that there *silvis* in thought balances *nemorum* better than it does *frondi* (see note 860).

[1076]As is perhaps suggested by the comma placed by H. after *Lycaei*, the objects naturally fall into two distinct pairs; and the relation to the verb of the first of

1.53–54 ventos. . . *vinclis* et *carcere* frenat[1077], G. 2.394 *lances*que et *liba* feremus[1078]. In the last example, I am assuming, as do those "others" vaguely referred to by C., that the *liba* are on the *lances*. C. himself, however, thinks the *lances* are probably for the *exta*, as in G. 2.194 lancibus . . . reddimus exta.

(2) Occupant an Animal

The object contained may be an animal, as in 11.494 in *pastus armenta*que tendit *equarum*[1079].

G. 1.414 *progeniem* parvam dulcisque revisere *nidos*[1080] and G. 4.56 *progeniem nidos*que fovent belong here if *nidos* means 'nests'[1081]. However, the word is interpreted as 'young' in G. 4.56 by C., in his note[1082] on that verse, and in G. 1.414 by N., in his note on 12.475 (where undoubtedly it has that meaning) pabula parva legens nidisque loquacibus escas. K. takes *nidi* as 'nestlings' in 5.214 *domus* et dulces latebroso in pumice *nidi*, in regard to which C.[1083] is doubtful. There is some point in calling *nidi* 'nestlings' there, for otherwise we get mere empty parallelism (*domus* = *nidi*), just as we do in the first two passages if we do *not* take *nidi* as 'nests' (*progeniem* = *nidos*). I particularly like the combination of the *two* ideas that are so dear to the head of a household[1084]: his home *and* his family, his little

---

these pairs is rather different from that of the second. Were *pascor* intransitive here, as it not infrequently is (see note 214), *silvas* and *summa* would be replaced by ablatives of place, *rubos* and *dumos* by ablatives of means. We may compare the similar test of inconcinnity applied to 4.679 and E. 9.40–41 (182). In translating, we should, as P. says, have to render *pascuntur* with the first pair of objects by 'browse among' or 'browse over', with the second pair by 'browse on'. In other words, the passage provides us with an instance of zeugma.

[1077]In taking *carcere* as representing the place containing the *vincula*, I am following C's. interpretation of *carcere* as a prison-house, in contradistinction to Henry's idea that it signifies a barrier in a race-course. C's. view is based largely on the use of this very word *vinclis*. But on the other hand, there may be no intrinsic relation between the two terms at all: *carcere* may simply imply a climax, a more severe form of restraint than *vinclis*.

[1078]Of course both *lances* and *liba* alike are carried, the first directly, the second indirectly. Just so, in 2.179 (see 7–8) the ships do the carrying directly and the sea indirectly; and in 6.230 (see 182) the dew does the sprinkling directly and the branch indirectly.

[1079]Compare G. 3.216 (232 and note 1075). Here as there, the collocation, though not strictly logical, is natural enough. There are two distinct steps involved: the horse first enters the pasture, and then mingles with the mares therein.

[1080]Compare William Cullen Bryant, Robert of Lincoln, 61–62, "Nobody knows but my mate and I Where our *nest* and our *nestlings* lie".

[1081]Or, in the second case, the equivalent of 'nests' in terms of the bee.

[1082]If I understand it correctly: it is not absolutely clear.

[1083]See his note on G. 4.17.

[1084]Vergil is as usual humanizing his animals, whether rook, dove, or bee. Compare page 63 and note 273, on the exquisitely tender passage G. 4.511–515; also note 721.

ones[1085]. To obtain this combination, I can see no objection to taking *nidi* of the dwellings in the two passages from the Georgics, and of the young[1086] in the passage from the Aeneid. In that event the latter passage also belongs in the present category as an example of the combination of terms for a place and for the animal occupying it.

(3) Occupant a Person

Extremely common is the combination of the terms denoting a place and the person or persons[1087] therein contained.

Here we must once more note 10.3–4 *terras . . . populos*que Latinos, already listed above (232); and with this we may compare 12.809 *Turnum* et *terras . . . reliqui*. 9.241 quaesitum *Aenean* et *moenia* Pallantea is likewise to be compared (unless we accept Heyne's reading of *ad* instead of *et*).

1.68 *Ilium* in Italiam portans victosque *penatis* also may be included, since in a sense the gods[1088], or at least their images, are a part of the city to which they belong.

[1085]This passage illustrates clearly the error into which the hendiadys addict, if I may so call him, is prone to fall. Finding two terms which, when coupled, do not make a perfect pair, he assumes that one should logically be subordinated to the other. Thus he can see hendiadys in such expressions as are commented on in notes 1078 and 1079, G. 2.394 and 11.494 respectively: C. regards the second of these as hendiadys, and of the first says that "others suppose a hendiadys". And Papillon and Haigh take G. 4.56 as hendiadys, rendering by "their young at home". How weak this is! And how unnecessary! There is no more need for subordination of one member to the other here than there is in the lines of Bryant quoted in note 1080. The bees love *both* their young *and* their homes; we know they would fight to defend either. The feeling is the same as causes Lucretius to associate *domus* with *uxor* and *nati* in 3.894–895, and Burns to associate the "lonely cot" with "th' expectant wee things" in the third stanza of The Cotter's Saturday Night.

[1086]There is no doubt that the word is capable of expressing both meanings in Vergil. In G. 4.17 ferunt dulcem nidis immitibus escam and in 12.475 pabula parva legens nidisque loquacibus escas, it must mean 'nestlings'—note *immitibus* and *loquacibus* (a comparison with *stagna loquacia* in 11.458 would be far-fetched here; *ranis . . . loquacibus* in G. 3.431 is a better parallel). In G. 4.307 nidum suspendat hirundo and G. 4.512–513 fetus, quos . . . nido implumis detraxit, it must mean 'nest'. In G. 2.210 illae <= aves> altum nidis petiere relictis and 8.235 dirarum nidis domus opportuna volucrum, its meaning is doubtful. In the latter passage it is combined with *domus*, as in 5.214 (see 233), and would here, as there, seem almost otiose in the sense of 'nests'; but on the other hand there does not seem so much point in specifying the young here as there, since what is said applies equally to the parent-birds.

[1087]For the pairing of a place and a person *not* contained therein, see 190–193. Compare note 1103.

[1088]Gods are not here differentiated from men as they were in the preceding section (224–231), since the special reason, given on 224–225, which made it suitable to accord them separate treatment there, is not applicable to the present section.

Another example is G. 4.481–483 *domus* atque intima Leti *Tartara* . . . -que . . . *Eumenides*[1089].

5.733–735 non me impia . . . *Tartara* habent, tristes *umbrae*, sed amoena piorum *concilia Elysium*que colo is less certain. Whether or not the phrase *concilia Elysiumque* belongs here depends on the exact meaning of *concilia*, which is doubtful. C. says, " 'Concilia' here simply means a meeting, perhaps with an additional notion of a place of meeting." Vergil uses *concilium* in ten[1090] other places, and in three of them it is susceptible of this second meaning: G. 1.24–25 quem . . . quae sint habitura deorum concilia incertum est[1091], 5.75 e concilio . . . ibat, 11.469–470 concilium . . . et magna incepta . . . deserit[1092]. A more cogent argument is the fact that nowhere else does Vergil employ the adjective *amoenus* of anything other than a geographical entity[1093]. Yet the meaning 'a meeting', not 'a meeting-place', has something in its favor, inasmuch as a reference to a locality and to its occupants[1094] certainly seems desirable here, if only to balance the pair, *Tartara* and *umbrae*, of the preceding line.

This line, too, raises a question. Jahn reads *Tartara habent tristes-que umbrae*, in order to preserve the balance just referred to; but, as C. says, "it is a mere assumption that any such balance exists". Moreover, there is but the slimmest MS. testimony in favor of this lection. C. himself reads *tristesve*, for the sake of observing Vergil's own division into Tartarus, Elysium, and the intermediate state[1095]. It does not seem to me, however, that the words *tristes umbrae* very clearly suggest this "intermediate state", and even if *-ve* be read I am inclined to refer *umbrae* to the same locality as *Tartara*; *-ve* will then be practically equivalent to *-que*, which it approaches in meaning very often, as the common MS. confusion between these two words amply attests. The consensus both of MSS. and of editions[1096] seems to favor the omission of both *-ve* and *-que*. Then we have an odd partitive apposition, which involves the coordination in thought of

---

[1089]Already referred to above, note 847.

[1090]One is doubtful. See Wetmore.

[1091]However, C. says here, " 'Concilia' seems to mean merely company or society."

[1092]Compare pages 145–146.

[1093]It is used with *virecta* in 6.638, with *fluvio* in 7.30 and 8.31, and with *Athesim* in 9.680.

[1094]But perhaps we may say that *piorum* serves sufficiently to denote the occupants.

[1095]In that case Vergil is pairing a place and a group not included therein, and this example then belongs not here, but with those cited above, 190–193.

[1096]Heinsius, Heyne, Ribbeck, K., H. C., however, calls such omission weak.

Tartara and its inhabitants[1097] *umbrae* just as much as would their copulation[1098].

Further examples are 9.454–456 ingens concursus ad ipsa *corpora* seminecisque *viros*[1099] tepidaque recentem caede *locum*, G. 3.339–340 quid. . . *pastores* Libyae, quid[1100] *pascua* versu prosequar et. . . *mapalia* . . .?, 7.775 *nymphae Egeriae nemori*que relegat[1101], 2.319 Panthus . . ., *arcis Phoebi*que sacerdos, 7.419 Calybe, *Iunonis* anus *templi*que sacerdos. This last example is almost surely exactly like the preceding one, to which Wagner, C., and K. compare it, K. adding that *anus* is an adjective here. It would, to be sure, be not un-Vergilian to distribute the genitives[1102], joining *Iunonis* with *anus* and *templi* with *sacerdos*; but *Iunonis anus* does not make much sense, and the parallelism of 2.319 points strongly in the opposite direction.

9.695 ruit ad *portam fratres*que, where *portam* indicates the place at which the *fratres* are standing, is similar to the preceding examples.

b. PERSON AND HIS ACCESSORIES

(1) Arms

We also find examples of the collocation of a person with something that he wears or carries. A mention of his arms is particularly common[1103].

We may note first a peculiar example involving verbs[1104], in which a statement with respect to the subject's entire person is combined with one dealing with his donning of arms. This is 9.179–180 quo pulchrior alter non *fuit* Aeneadum Troiana neque *induit arma*. Here *fuit* is a much more sweeping statement than *induit arma*, whether or not we choose to stress the latter clause as do Ti. Donatus and Forbiger, and understand it particularly of Euryalus's appearance in arms.

Examples of the common type, involving substantives, follow: 10.672 *me* meaque *arma* secuti; 3.156 *te* . . . tuaque *arma* secuti;

[1097]There is also a possibility that the 'sad shades' of Tartarus are not the miserable spirits that occupy it, but its gloomy shadows; compare 6.734 clausae tenebris et carcere caeco. But this seems less likely to me.

[1098]Compare note 1073, on 3.90–92 and 6.43.

[1099]On the first two members in relation to each other, see 238.

[1100]'Connective repetition'; compare note 46.

[1101]With this and the preceding example, compare G. 3.216 and 11.494, cited on 232 and 233, respectively.

[1102]Compare note 468, on 6.298–299, and page 119, on 1.693–694.

[1103]These examples correspond to those on 194 as do the examples on 234–236 to those on 190–193. See note 1087.

[1104]Compare note 604.

11.747 *arma virum*que[1105] ferens[1106]; 6.490 videre *virum* fulgentiaque *arma* per umbras[1107]; 9.796 per *tela viros*que; 9.556–557 inter et *hostis* inter et *arma*[1108]; E. 10.45 *tela* inter media atque adversos . . . *hostis*, with which we may compare the phrases per *tela*, per *hostis*[1109], found in 2.358 and 2.527, and perque *hostis*, per *tela*, found in 12.682; 10.237 *tela* inter media atque . . . *Latinos*; 9.659 *deum* . . . divinaque *tela*.

We may note here also 8.663–664 *Salios* nudosque *Lupercos* lanigerosque *apices* et . . . *ancilia*. Not unlike the references to arms in the foregoing examples is the reference here to the *ancilia*, which we are probably to conceive of as being carried by their guardians, the Salii[1110]. The *ancilia* are so extremely important that there is scarcely any violation of logic in their being made coordinate with the two sets of priests.

(2) Wearing Apparel

The statement just made with respect to the *ancilia* applies likewise, though to a more limited extent, to the *apices*, also associated with the Salii[1111]. The coordination of the Salii with their *apices* is like that of Vesta with her *vittae* in 2.296 *vittas Vestam*que potentem.

[1105]Of course the phrase here—Vergil's "favourite combination", as C. says—inevitably suggests the famous opening of the Aeneid; but that is different, as in 1.1 the arms are not necessarily those of Aeneas alone, and therefore that passage belongs rather with those cited on 194 (see notes 855 and 1103).

[1106]We may compare 11.593–594 *corpus* et *arma* inspoliata feram, though the arms perhaps do not form a part of the *body* to the same extent as they do of the *man*. However, (as I pointed out in a paper, On Confusion of Terms for Soul and Terms for Body in Vergil, read at a meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, in Cincinnati, on December 28, 1927), the body and the actual individual are often confused: compare the common use of the periphrasis with *corpus* (200) and the English terms *everybody*, *nobody*. This use, both in Latin and in English, is quite different from the use of *corpus* and *body* referred to in note 1113.

[1107]The advocates of hendiadys may well cite this line as an example thereof. The Greeks saw the gleaming arms of the man, and they saw the man by means of his gleaming arms. Yet as usual Vergil is expressing *two* ideas, and *not* 'one through two': the Greeks really did see the man himself, they could recognize him by his size, his build, etc., all those points that go to make up that essentially heroic figure, the *vir*; and at the same time they could *especially* (compare 226) note the most conspicuous detail, the gleaming arms, seen clearly, and afar. For another reference to a noteworthy spectacle of this kind, compare 8.92–93 miratur. . .fulgentia longe scuta (cited above, 111).

[1108]Strictly speaking, we must note as coordinates not the two nouns but the two prepositional phrases. The inconcinnity, however, is the same. This comment applies also to G. 2.536–537, cited on 99 (compare note 392), and to two English examples, the passage from Nicholas Murray Butler, cited in note 594 (see the closing sentence in that note), and the passage from E. M. Forster, cited on 231–232.

[1109]The repetition of *per* replaces a conjunction; compare note 46.

[1110]To be sure, the mention of the Luperci constitutes an interruption. Because of this interruption it would perhaps be equally in place to class this example with those on 194. Compare note 1105.

[1111]Once more the reference to the *nudi* Luperci seems out of place. Compare note 1110.

c. PERSON OR ANIMAL AND PART OF HIS OR ITS BODY

Often, too, a person is made parallel not with some removable adjunct of his person, such as arms or head-gear, but with his body or some integral part thereof[1112].

For mention of the body as a whole, we may note 11.22–23 *socios* inhumataque *corpora* terrae mandemus, and perhaps 9.454–455 ad ipsa *corpora* seminecisque *viros*. In the latter instance, however, C. regards *seminecis . . . viros* as distinguished from *corpora*, and he is probably right[1113].

For mention of a part of the body, we may note first an instance applying not to persons but to horses. This is 10.570–571 Niphaei quadriiugis in *equos* adversaque *pectora* tendit. In listing this passage here, I am following the interpretation of K., who with *pectora* would supply *eorum* = *equorum*. N., however, takes *pectora* of Niphaeus[1114].

2.622–623 dirae *facies* inimicaque Troiae *numina* magna deum belongs here, whether *facies* means 'faces', as Milton seems to think[1115], or 'forms', the much more likely interpretation suggested by C.[1116].

Also to be noted are 5.340–341 totum caveae *consessum* . . . et *ora* prima patrum[1117]; and 5.577 omnem . . . *consessum oculos*que suorum, which is, as C. says, "a good parallel" to the preceding example[1118].

[1112]Compare 2.348–349, 5.729, and 5.750–751 (cited on 202), also 11.336–339 (cited on 114–115), in each of which a term denoting a part of the body is set in apposition with a noun denoting the possessor or possessors thereof.

[1113]It is natural to assume that *seminecis . . . viros* represents the men in whom some vestige of life still remains, while *ipsa corpora* indicates the corpses, the men who have become mere shells or bodies, since the vital spark of soul has fled. The English use of *corpse*, and of *body* in the sense of 'corpse', is precisely comparable. See further on the use of *corpora* notes 891 and 892; and contrast note 1106.

[1114]According to that view, too, *equos* and *pectora* make rather an odd combination. We may compare the examples listed on 153, in illustration of the correlation of a member of the body and some external object. However, the present passage, taken in this way, seems rather harsher than those. I seem to feel the need of *ipsius* with *pectora*, even though I realize that *Niphaei*, preceding both *equos* and *pectora* as it does, can perfectly well apply to both.

[1115]Compare his "dreadful faces", cited by C. (the expression occurs in Paradise Lost 12.644).

[1116]On the meaning of *facies* in Vergil, see note 880.

[1117]Compare 229 and note 1057.

[1118]There is one difference, however. While the genitive *patrum* refers to only a part of the whole *consessus*, as *prima* plainly indicates, *suorum* may be equivalent to *consessum*. In that case we have an approach to hendiadys of the type already frequently pointed out (e. g., notes 863, 962; see note 1129 for a complete list of references).

In 12.219–221 adiuvat incessu tacito progressus et aram suppliciter venerans demisso lumine *Turnus* tabentesque[1119] *genae* et iuvenali in corpore *pallor*, Turnus is made parallel to his own cheeks and his own pallor[1120]. However, the true parallel for *genae*—or rather *tabentes . . . genae*[1121]—is to be found in the phrases *incessu tacito* and *demisso lumine*, and the use of *Turnus* as the main word in the phrase is comparable to that of *urbe* in the often-cited *ab urbe condita*[1122]. N. paraphrases *adiuvat . . . progressus* (*Turnus*) by *adiuvat progressio eius*; but I would go a step farther than that, and say that the logical subject for *adiuvat* would be not *incessu tacito progressus et . . . venerans demisso lumine Turnus*, as Vergil wrote; not *incessu tacito progressio et arae*[1123] *veneratio demisso lumine*[1124] *Turni*, as N. would probably write, if we may judge from his note; but *incessus tacitus progredientis et aram suppliciter venerantis demissum lumen Turni*, which provides a true parallel to *tabentes . . . genae et . . . pallor* or to either of the proposed more logical substitutes which were probably fused to form this phrase, as already explained (in note 1120)[1125]. The other extreme, which was perhaps fused with this to produce the sentence as Vergil wrote it, would be an expression which would keep the '*ab urbe condita*' construction all the way through, more or less after this manner: *adiuvat incessu tacito progressus et aram suppliciter*

[1119]If the reading *pubentes*, for which W. Warde Fowler argues very plausibly (The Death of Turnus, 65–66, Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 1919), be adopted, the same sort of reasoning will apply to it as is here employed in respect to *tabentes*, except that *pubentes* in thought balances *iuvenali* rather than *pallor*.

[1120]On a smaller scale, these last two members are also illustrative of the general principle under discussion here. The *genae* are made coordinate with one of their own qualities, their *pallor*, which in thought is really parallel with their attribute *tabentes* (compare 165 and note 699). We may say that there is a fusion of *tabes genarum et pallor*, the expression logically demanded as the subject of *adiuvat*, and *tabentes genae et pallentes*, an '*ab urbe condita*' type of expression. It is true that the *pallor* is represented as not limited to his cheeks, but as spreading over his whole body (note *iuvenali in corpore*); but this does not alter the fact that the abstract term of quality *pallor* corresponds in thought to the adjective *tabentes* rather than to the noun *genae*. Compare 214, and the examples on 217–218.

G. 3.500–501 demissae *aures*, incertus . . . *sudor* et *ille* . . . frigidus, apart from the fact that here a copulative verb is to be supplied, is somewhat similar, in that the first sign of ill health is conveyed by the adjective *demissae*, and the second by the noun *sudor*, if we see a dangerous symptom in the mere presence of the sweat without regard to any question of irregularity or low temperature.

[1121]See note 1120. [1122]Compare 214–220. [1123]Or *ad aram*?

[1124]Viewed as ablatives of quality, not ablatives of manner as they are in the original passage, *incessu tacito* and *demisso lumine* would serve as good parallels for *tabentes*.

[1125]It would be splitting hairs to say that this hypothetical phrase is really a genuine parallel to *tabentes genae et pallentes*, and that even it, to serve as a parallel for *tabes genarum et pallor*, would have to be altered into *incessus* (genitive) *taciturnitas et demissio luminis*. There is a point at which an '*ab urbe condita*' expression ceases to be felt as such.

venerans demisso lumine Turnus, tabentibusque[1126] *genis et pallentibus.*

8.437–438 conexosque *anguis* ipsamque . . . *Gorgona*[1127] may be classed here, since the snakes form the locks of the Gorgon[1128], and may therefore be counted as a part of her body.

At first sight 7.658 centum *anguis* cinctamque . . . serpentibus *Hydram* looks very much like the previous example. The *centum angues* are, according to C., identical with the *serpentes*, and should therefore be parallel in case to *serpentibus* and not to *Hydram*, of which they form a part. If *serpentibus* were omitted, it would be easier to see how C. can class this expression as an example of hendiadys. As it is, the phrase seems to be of exactly the same type as those referred to in foot-notes at various points in the present discussion[1129]. If the creatures designated by the term *centum anguis* are not identical with those indicated by *serpentibus*, we have a perfectly logical coordination of the hundred serpents on the one hand, and the single hydra on the other. In the Greek passage which C. cites, after Cerda, as Vergil's model[1130], Euripides *Phoenissae* 1134–1137[1131], the term ὕδρας in 1136 seems to mean much the same as ἐχίδναις in 1135, and there is no suggestion that the creatures so called have their own attendant ἔχιδναι. To a Greek a ὕδρα was probably a water-snake and nothing more; it was merely a supremely dangerous water-snake that Heracles slew at Lerna. But to a Roman[1132], as to us, a *hydra*[1133] was one particular monster, either *the* Water-Snake slain by

---

[1126]This *-que* joins the final, adjectival ablatives of quality not with the adverbial ablatives of manner above (*incessu tacito* and *demisso lumine*), but with the participles *progressus* and *venerans*—a perfectly possible Vergilian incongruity (compare 117–118). On the use of these ablatives with a proper noun, see note 39.

[1127]Compare 243.

[1128]Compare 7.346–347 (quoted in note 1137), where the snake is called 'one of <the Fury's> locks'.

[1129]Notes 598, 863, 931, 962, 987, 1001, 1118.

[1130]To be sure, the two passages are not very close. The similarities may be due to vague reminiscences on Vergil's part, or even, possibly, to mere coincidence, rather than to deliberate imitation.

[1131]ταῖς δ' ἑβδόμαις Ἄδραστος ἐν πύλαισιν ἦν,
ἑκατὸν ἐχίδναις ἀσπίδ' ἐκπληρῶν γραφῇ,
ὕδρας ἔχων λαιοῖσιν ἐν βραχίοσιν
Ἀργεῖον αὔχημ'.

[1132]The foreign word has, in the new language, assumed a highly specialized and strangely elevated meaning. Just so, to take a less dignified example, the ordinary French term for any shed is applied in English only to the very particular and complicated structure used for air-ships, the *hangar* (compare also our limited use of *garage*); and, to take a more dignified example, the ordinary Greek term for any book is in English restricted to *the* Book of Books.

[1133]A *hydrus*, however, was different; it was just a snake. Compare G. 3.545 and 7.753, where it is associated with the viper; G. 4.458, where the reference is to the serpent that caused Eurydice's death; 7.447, where Allecto's locks are meant. (The form occurring in 7.753 and 7.447, *hydris*, might be derived from *hydra*; but I think we may feel reasonably certain that it is not.)

Hercules, or the awful creature that dwelt in Hades, and that was not so much a single snake as a combination of many snakes perhaps with some other substance, to which they served as mere auxiliary or adjunct members[1134]. The hydra mentioned here is not, apparently, a snake herself; she is 'girt with snakes'. And I doubt whether the one other hydra that Vergil mentions by name[1135] is a snake either; she is a horrible creature with fifty black heads, who is compared not with Heracles's ὕδρα, the *belua Lernae* of 6.287[1136], but with the Fury Tisiphone of 6.571, another fearful being who is *attended by snakes*[1137]. That is just the conception, I think, that Vergil had here. He found, indeed, a passage of Euripides in which ὕδραι (note the plural) are mentioned as animals similar to, or identical with, (ἑκατὸν) ἔχιδναι; but, as occasionally happens[1138], he either misinterpreted or

---

[1134]As they did to the Gorgon, 8.437–438 (240 and note 1128), and to the Fury, 7.447 (note 1133) and 7.346–347 (note 1137).

[1135]6.576–577 quinquaginta atris immanis hiatibus Hydra saevior intus habet sedem.

[1136]Referred to again in 8.300 as *Lernaeus . . . anguis*.

[1137]In 6.572 intentans anguis, she seems to brandish them in her hand; but the usual conception represents them as twined about her head: note G. 4.482–483 implexae crinibus anguis Eumenides, and compare Culex 218 Tisiphone, serpentibus undique compta, and Horace, Carmina 2.13.35–36 intorti capillis Eumenidum . . . angues. Perhaps, however, this head-dress was removable at will. We may so conclude, certainly, concerning Allecto, from the statement about her in 7.346–347 huic dea caeruleis unum de crinibus anguem conicit; and what applies to one of the dread sisterhood probably is true of all (compare 12.847–848 paribusque <Diras> revinxit serpentum spiris). —For the comparison of the Hydra with the Fury, observe *saevior* in 6.577 (quoted in note 1135).

[1138]Other instances, possible or practically certain, which I have noted are as follows:—(1) E. 8.34 promissa . . . barba, perhaps, as C. says, an imitation of Theocritus 3.9 προγένειος, a term which the best editors, according to Haverfield, interpret as meaning 'having a prominent chin' rather than 'bearded'; (2) E. 8.41 ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error, where the use of *ut . . . ut . . . ut* apparently indicates that Vergil read ὡς . . . ὡς . . . ὡς instead of ὡς . . . ὡς . . . ὡς in the Theocritean original 2.82 χὡς ἴδον, ὡς ἐμάνην, ὡς μευ περὶ θυμὸς ἰάφθη; (3) E. 8.58 omnia vel medium fiat mare, where Vergil seems to have misread ἔναλλα as ἐνάλια in Theocritus 1.134 πάντα δ'ἔναλλα γένοιτο; (4) G. 1.277 pallidus Orcus, where Orcus represents Ὅρκον of Hesiod (Works and Days 804); (5) G. 1.375 aëriae. . .grues, where *aëriae* appears to be a mistranslation of ἠέριαι, 'early in the morning', applied to cranes by Homer, Iliad 3.7; (6) G. 1.382 densis . . . alis, which must have been suggested by Aratus 969 πτερὰ πυκνά (so C.); (7) 9.716 Inarime, which indicates that Vergil read Εἰναρίμοις instead of εἰν Ἀρίμοις in Homer, Iliad 2.783. These may not all be actual mistakes. Vergil has the authority of the Scholiast and of Hesychius on his side in the first example, and of Apollonius Rhodius in the fifth (so Haverfield). In the seventh he has the support of Pliny, Naturalis Historia 3.82 Homero Inarime dicta (C's. citation of "the poets" as also using the form is too vague to be satisfactory; they may simply be following Vergil); and Cerda believes that Homer may actually have written Εἰναρίμοις. In regard to the second example P. suggests that "the exact force of ὡς . . . ὥς <in Homer> was soon forgotten, and in Theocritus the phrase merely indicates that seeing and falling in love were one and the same thing" (we may compare the controversy that has been carried on concerning the force of *dum . . . dum* in Catullus 62.45: see Quintilian 9.3.16, Robinson Ellis's note in his Commentary, and Charles Knapp in The Classical Review 10 [1896], 365–368). Moreover, Vergil may have had his own good reasons for such changes

misapplied the Greek, whether intentionally or no; and he made his single hydra not an animal like the *centum angues*, but a queer monster, herself *cincta serpentibus*. In other words, he still keeps her parallel to the *centum angues*; but he mentions this additional detail about her, that she is herself *cincta serpentibus*. I am strongly inclined to doubt, then, that C. is right in censuring Vergil for letting it "seem at first sight that the 'angues' and the 'serpentes' were different"; for I think that they *are* different, and that the *centum*[1139] *angues* and the Hydra do not, as do the other examples cited above, bear the relation to each other of member and body, part and whole[1140].

d. WHOLE AND PART

Occasionally two different physical members, one of which is a part of the other, are made parallel, as in 2.531 ante *oculos* . . . et *ora* parentum, 11.887 ante *oculos* . . . -que *ora* parentum, 11.121 conversique *oculos* inter se atque *ora* tenebant, 12.656–657 in te *ora* Latini, in te[1141] *oculos* referunt. We may compare 6.108 ire ad *conspectum* . . . genitoris et *ora*, 'the sight and the face', if *genitoris* is a subjective genitive; but it is almost surely an objective genitive, as C. takes it. A better parallel is 10.821 *vultum* vidit . . . et *ora*, 'the look and the

as he made: see P. in respect to the fourth and the sixth instances. But the third is certainly hard to account for as anything but a slip. If the passage under discussion above is an example of the same sort of departure, it is certainly one that is less important than most of those here listed. It is interesting to remark that all the examples noted, except 9.716 and our own passage, are from early writings (compare note 307, last paragraph).

Of course this discussion is not to be interpreted as indicating any belief on my part that Vergil did not really know Greek! On the subject see Virgil's Knowledge of Greek, by Henry Rushton Fairclough, in Classical Philology 25 (1930), 37–46—an article which I read some time after writing the foregoing paragraph.

[1139]Note that in 6.576 (quoted in note 1135) the Hydra has only fifty *hiatus*, not a hundred. But no real importance need be attached to that point, which is just the sort of matter about which Vergil would never have troubled to be consistent. Compare the different kinds of wood assigned to the wooden horse in Aeneid 2 (referred to above, note 1052). Having once departed from tradition, which certainly gave *the* Hydra nine heads, Vergil would doubtless not hesitate to vary his variants. The Roman poets in general gave themselves considerable freedom in their method of handling myths. We may recall that Horace attributes a hundred heads to a monster who assuredly appears to be Cerberus in Carmina 2.13.34—the ode in the last strophe of which he transfers to Hades Prometheus from the Caucasus, and Orion from the stars.

[1140]It must be said on the other side, however, that the example cited just before this one, 8.437–438 (240), would seem to point in the opposite direction, as in it the *angues* are certainly a part of the Gorgon (compare note 1128). We even have, by an odd coincidence, a secondary reference to serpents (8.435–436 aegida . . . squamis serpentum auroque polibant), which likewise seem to belong to the Gorgon, though here again there is a doubt: compare C's. note, "It is difficult to say whether these scales are the same as those of the serpents mentioned in the next line, or not." However, parallelism alone is not a sufficient refutation of evidence which seems to point the other way.

[1141]'Connective repetition'; compare note 46.

face'. But both *conspectum* and *vultum*, being far less concrete than *oculos*, correspond to *ora* much less closely than *oculos* does[1142].

In 7.94–95 *tergo* stratisque . . . *velleribus*, in a certain sense *tergo* seems part of *velleribus*, and in another *velleribus* seems part of *tergo*. At all events the two are assuredly not coordinate[1143].

8.435–438 *aegida*que . . . conexosque *anguis* ipsamque in pectore divae *Gorgona* affords a double example, since not only do the *angues* and the *Gorgo* form a part of the *aegis*, but also almost surely the *angues* form a part of the *Gorgo*. See above, 240.

Perhaps we may list here 9.359–360 *phaleras* . . . et aurea bullis *cingula*. I think that Heyne is right in taking the *phalerae* here as not distinct from the *cingula* (though I do not concur in C's. view that this interpretation involves hendiadys). Certainly 9.364 haec... umeris...fortibus aptat could not apply to such *phalerae* as are mentioned in 5.310 equum phaleris insignem. C. explains the fact that reference is made only to the *cingula* here, and only to the *phalerae* in 9.458 multo phaleras sudore receptas, as due to Vergil's love of variety; but it would surely be simpler to refer *cingula* and *phalerae* to one and the same object—the whole belt, and the disks or bosses that form an ornamental and conspicuous part thereof[1144].

Comparable examples are 8.433 *currum*que *rotas*que, and 12.379 *rota* . . . et . . . *axis*.

Whether 7.665 *mucrone veru*que Sabello belongs here or not depends on the precise meaning of *mucro* and of *veru*. C., in viewing the passage (according to Heyne's suggestion) as an instance of hendiadys, and explaining that "the 'veru' or 'verutum' seems to have answered the purpose of a sword, not a spear", shows that he takes *mucrone* as the sword-point, in other words as part of the *veru*[1145]. But in the first place the *veru*, though it may have "answered the purpose of a sword", was certainly not a sword[1146]; C. himself on G.

[1142]Perhaps we may compare the combination of *vox* and *lingua* in G. 4.525–526, cited on 151 as an example of the combination of abstract and concrete, and on 183 as an example of the combination of causal and resultant; and the same combination in 3.457, cited with G. 4.525–526 on 182.

[1143]For the additional discrepancy in number, see 6.

[1144]Rather a good parallel for this is 10.496–497 pondera baltei impressumque nefas, if we resolve *pondera baltei* into *ponderosum balteum* (see 208), possibly also 1.640–641 ingens argentum mensis, caelataque in auro fortia facta patrum (see 203).

[1145]I suppose the point of a spear or a dart might be called a *mucro* too; but C. does not appear to consider this possibility, and certainly in Vergil, whenever a *mucro* is mentioned a sword seems to be involved. However, the word is applied to the point of a *falx* by Columella (4.25.1) and to the point of a *culter* by Juvenal (14.217).

[1146]Elsewhere in Vergil the word means 'spit'. See G. 2.396 in veribus torrebimus exta, 1.212 <viscera> in frusta secant veribusque trementia figunt, 5.103 subiciunt veribus prunas.

2.168 Volscosque verutos says that the *verutum* was "a short dart"[1147]. And in the second place the *mucro* is not necessarily merely a part of a sword; it may be used by metonymy for the whole sword[1148], as K. indicates in his Vocabulary, and as is certainly the case, e. g., in 12.736 patrio mucrone relicto.

8.550 nuntia ventura Ascanio *rerum*que *patris*que differs from the preceding examples only in being abstract rather than concrete. It resembles the rest in that it involves a relationship of part and whole, inasmuch as that one of various subjects and affairs in general which Ascanius is particularly eager to hear about is his father.

e. MAN AND HIS QUALITIES OR HIS DEEDS

Likewise in the metaphysical rather than the physical realm are examples of the conjunction of a man and his qualities or his deeds. Here belong 1.565–566 quis Troiae nesciat urbem, *virtutes*que *viros*que, and 10.791–793 tuaque optima *facta*. . . non equidem nec *te*. . . silebo.

At first glance it seems as if 10.369–372 per *vos* et fortia *facta*, per ducis Euandri nomen devictaque bella spemque meam . . . , fidite ne pedibus were an exact parallel for the above; but N. prefers to regard this as an imitation of the Greek πρός σε τούτου (λίσσομαι) construction, and K., too, construes *vos* with an understood *oro*. The use of *et* after *vos* involves some difficulty; but it occurs in the parallel passage from Ennius[1149] cited by N., and it can be explained as a correlative for another *et* (such as actually occurs in Ennius) which is replaced by the second *per*[1150]; the regular form would be, as K. says, *per et fortia facta et ducis Euandri nomen*, etc.

We may note here also 2.548–549 mea tristia *facta* degeneremque *Neoptolemum* narrare memento. But this is not quite the same, since 'degenerate Neoptolemus' stands for 'the degeneracy of Neoptolemus'[1151].

[1147]This sense fits just as well as that of 'sword' in the passage from Livy, 1.43.6 hastam et verutum, which C. cites (on 7.665) to prove that the *verutum* was used as a sword rather than as a spear; a *short* dart could be contrasted with a *hasta* just as well as a sword could. A *hasta* was a heavier weapon than a *pilum* (see Pauly-Wissowa, 7.2502), and a *verutum* was the same as a *pilum*, according to Festus 514 (Lindsay).

[1148]Compare the English use of 'blade'.

[1149]Hectoris Lytra 186 (Vahlen[2]) per vos et vostrum imperium et fidem . . ., commiserescite.

[1150]Compare note 46.

[1151]Compare 219.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it seems scarcely necessary to set out the one point that must clearly stand forth as a result of this study, that Vergil tends to coordinate non-coordinate elements to a great degree[1152]. That he does so to a greater degree than do other Latin writers, at least of his time, I should regard as highly probable, though, without a corresponding and comparative study for each of them, I am of course not in a position to make any definitive statement in regard to this question.

In so far as the characteristic is primarily one peculiar to Vergil, it may be due to a number of causes. Metrical exigencies may sometimes be a compelling, or at least a persuasive, factor, though less often, I am convinced, than many tend to fancy. Love of variety for its own sake I believe to be far more influential. Possibly most cogent of all is the gain in force and effectiveness, or in delicacy and subtlety, that is not infrequently to be attained through a sacrifice of strict logic and balance. Vergil, being a poet, and a sensitive poet, does not hesitate to make his choice when such alternatives confront him.

This brings me to more general considerations. On the whole, I feel it safe to assert that the influences moving Vergil especially would to some extent affect any poet, that, other things being equal, the prose-writer is always likely to seek perfect balance, and the poet, picturesque variety[1153].

On the other hand, the tendency of prose-writers away from balance and toward variety increased with the passage of time[1154]. Cicero at

---

[1152]To be sure, some of his common combinations might well be found in any Latin writer, and, indeed, in any writer in any language. For instance, the coordination of relative and non-relative clauses (58–67) is a regular feature in Latin in general, and, indeed, may be illustrated from English as well (note 247).

[1153]It may well be that the Roman poet was particularly eager to employ variety as a poetic device, since he was comparatively limited in the use of another poetic device, the employment of a special poetic vocabulary. On this see Hardie (cited in note 5); observe particularly the quotation from him in note 11, and also the following passages: "In turning to Latin, we must not expect to find anything so elaborate and so highly differentiated and developed as the poetic language of Greece" (197); and "Latin has not a great many words which are restricted to poetry altogether, words which never, or practically never, occur in prose" (199). This, however, of course does not mean that a poet who is in a position to avail himself of a special poetic vocabulary will not employ variety also: Sophocles, I feel sure, uses the latter device quite as frequently as Vergil.

[1154]Compare Professor Charles Knapp's comment (page 148, in A Phase of the Development of Prose Writing among the Romans, Classical Philology 13.138–154), concerning the greater degree of libration to be found in Caesar, Cicero, and Livy, as compared with that exhibited by the prose-writers of the Silver Age (with the latter he groups Sallust, who, as is well-known, is very different from the typical prose-writers of the Golden Age).

the beginning of the Golden Age, as the lover of balance *par excellence*, and Tacitus at the end of the Silver Age, as the seeker after variety *par excellence*, stand at opposing poles. Midway between these two extremes stands Livy, Vergil's contemporary. That Livy's style owes much to Vergil's is a commonplace too well-known to demand illustration or discussion[1155]. We seem, then, to be justified in concluding, on the basis of this particular type of evidence as well as for many other reasons, that a turning-point in the development of Latin prose style was, if not effected, at least affected, by the influence of that master of Latin poetic style, Vergil.

[1155]See, e. g., J. W. Mackail, Latin Literature, 152 (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1895).

INDEXES

In each instance, references following the letter N. or the letters NN. are to footnotes; all other references are to pages.

Footnotes are not cited if they deal only with the subject or the passage treated by that portion of the text to which they refer, since the reader by turning to the pages indicated will have ready control of the pertinent footnotes as well.

I. INDEX LOCORUM

A. Passages in Vergil[1156]

Eclogue 1

2—N. 1024
27—134; NN. 297, 563
57—201
64–65—7
74—201

Eclogue 2

2—N. 373
3—201
14–15—219–220
32–33—N. 1016
37–38—58–59
40–41—165; N. 699

Eclogue 3

3—201
8–9—13–14; NN. 61, 169, 188
12–15—53
17–18—N. 616
41–42—90, 94; N. 166
72—15, 61; NN. 53, 62, 376, 520
102—NN. 294, 295, 297, 307
104–105—27, 34
106–107—27, 34

Eclogue 4

3—N. 1024
6—NN. 46, 72, 73
13—N. 1055
50–52—98, 101
53–54—N. 860
61—105
63—N. 1010

Eclogue 5

5–6—17–18; NN. 485, 506
13–14—N. 208
27—N. 1024
28—N. 1024
29–31—221–222
43—N. 1024
44—NN. 54, 530, 1024
45–46—100–101
58—N. 1024
59—N. 1024
60—N. 616
60–61—N. 929
77—N. 214
79—N. 173
83–84—89–90, 90
88–89—72–73, 74; NN. 102, 293, 295
89—N. 295

Eclogue 6

1—N. 1010
2—N. 375
3—NN. 375, 816
6–9—N. 375
23—N. 929
27–28—18; N. 76
33–34—231; N. 1073
43—84
43–44—N. 281
64—N. 376
64–65—N. 375
74–78—97
74–81—94–96
78—NN. 420, 421, 980
79–81—84
83—N. 375
84—N. 375
85—20
85–86—20–21

Eclogue 7

6–8—25–26
7—N. 179
31–32—33
35–36—33–34
58—N. 415

Eclogue 8

1–4—40
34—N. 1138
41—N. 1138
58—N. 1138
73–75—N. 274
95—NN. 158, 785
95–96—177
95–98—38
101–102—18; N. 506

Eclogue 9

6—NN. 295, 307
9—201
26—NN. 295, 307
31—N. 214
40–41—182; N. 1076
51—231

Eclogue 10

2–3—137
16–17—33
45—237
46–48—NN. 295, 307

Georgics 1

5–6—N. 831
5–12—N. 831
6—N. 358
7—N. 173
17–21—224–225; N. 1036
24–25—235
25–26—101
36–37—32; N. 150
56–59—192, 207; N. 841
77–78—202–203; N. 1028
86–87—179; N. 792
92—205; N. 909
92–93—N. 928
127—N. 463
141–142—123–124; N. 514
147–148—N. 1016
162—203
184–185—90
198–199—N. 926
199–203—43–45, 59; NN. 526, 722, 799
203—N. 35
204–205—NN. 886, 911, 917
206–207—N. 706
208—N. 51
212—203
213—N. 446
219—203
252–255—97
261–263—25; N. 100
271—N. 616
277—N. 1138
277–286—80
287–288—98; NN. 587, 745

[1156]By "Vergil" here, reference is made only to the undisputed works of Vergil. Compare note 1.

311–313—93; NN. 362, 569
325–326—N. 753
338–339—227; N. 833
340—17
343–344—N. 173
345–347—59
356—N. 316
375—N. 1138
382—N. 1138
383–384—98; N. 464
393—N. 463
414—233–234
420–422—139–140; NN. 152, 551
422–423—218
429–11
433—118
434—137
438—139
492—195
498—226–227
503–504—N. 415

Georgics 2

1–2—N. 152
42—N. 1052
45–46—17
63–64—16
65–66—5
65–67—N. 358
66–67—5
101—11
103–104—N. 297
104—N. 297
110–111—N. 534
115—195
118–135—N. 418
120–121—97
122–125—74; N. 293
127–130—61
128–129—54
137–139—192
155—142, 176
160—149
161–162—216–217
168—243–244
174–175—154–155, 157–158, 179; NN. 654, 675
182–183—217
185–188—47
187–188—50
194—233
201–202—6; NN. 25, 26
203–204—137
203–207—138–139; N. 460
207–211—61; N. 215
210—NN. 311, 1086
210–211—N. 270
211—N. 291
238—137
238–241—75; N. 485
240—N. 715
241–242—N. 336
255–256—93
266–267—40; N. 215
290—128
296—N. 287
323—NN. 860, 1075
327—NN. 54, 700
343—N. 407
364—NN. 2, 404
372–375—52
378–379—181
380–389—78–79
388–389—N. 157
391–392—92, 93
394—233; N. 1085
396—N. 1146
428–121
471–473—218
473—N. 991
475–477—38
477–482—94, 97; N. 166
478—N. 992
479—N. 569
491–492—159, 178
508–510—N. 297
509—NN. 297, 816
527–531—78
536–537—99; NN. 443, 1108

Georgics 3

9—NN. 605, 661
17—165
20—149; N. 616
23–25—97–98
30—N. 842
30–31—192
35–36—197
56–59—137
58—N. 880
68—205; N. 881
73—85
73–74—N. 336
108–109 — 81–82; NN. 302, 485
112—83
113–114—221
147–148—50–51
154–156—45, 184; NN. 517, 604, 738
155–156—123
156—NN. 503, 517, 522
162–164—85–86
163—N. 337
163–164—161; N. 650
174–176—N. 337
176—N. 337
176–178—N. 337
179–181—112–113
209–210—101
210—213; NN. 962, 987
212–213—127; N. 741
216—232; NN. 1079, 1101
216–217—N. 336
220–221—9
226—159, 178
231—N. 214
237–239—127
242–244—196
253–254—173–174; N. 740
258—N. 219
260–262—65
262—65
264–265—196; N. 868
266—N. 260
272–273—N. 23
277—116
277–278—213
277–279—99; N. 443
278–279—61–62; N. 215
282–283—53–54
295–298—N. 93
314–315—232; N. 214
329–336—N. 93
330—N. 220
339–340—236; N. 1101
394–395—N. 337
407–408—213
416–417—37
417–176
418—177
431—N. 1086
438–439—223
439—N. 44
456—N. 209
459–460—183–184; NN. 604, 738
464–467—109–110; N. 435
498—161, 178; N. 756
498–508—188–189; N. 604
500–501—N. 1120
525–526—100–101
528—212; N. 214
537—N. 616
544–545—5
545—N. 1133
561–562—181

Georgics 4

8–12—NN. 215, 264
9—N. 234
11—N. 228
13—NN. 25, 896
13–14—200–201
17—NN. 1083, 1086
39–40—177

48–50—92–93; NN. 385, 581
56—233–234; N. 1085
67—N. 297
67–70—N. 297
85—N. 25
86–87—N. 297
93–94—172
106–107—N. 336
110–111—N. 932
118–119—93
127–129—65
151—177
153–154—N. 53
158—N. 195
159—NN. 195, 944
162—N. 195
163—N. 195
165–168—48–49
168—201
178–179—100
181—N. 214
202—232
206–208—N. 297
210–211—192
215—N. 164
215–218—38
219–221—122; N. 463
246—201
251–259 — 79–80; NN. 297, 441
253–259—N. 825
254—N. 316
254–255—N. 441
255—N. 316
257—336
257–259—N. 317
260—80
267–268—207; N. 928
273–275—131; N. 547
283–285—93
300—202
307—N. 1086
355–356—NN. 718, 736
388–389—197
399–400—144; NN. 613, 626
458—N. 1133
461–463—192
475–476—200; N. 891
481–483—235
482–483—NN. 847, 1137
511–514—62–63
511–515—NN. 273, 1084
512–513—N. 1086
513—NN. 291, 311, 560
525–526—151, 183; NN. 764, 1142
559–560—211, 212

Aeneid 1

1—NN. 376, 855, 1105
2—N. 33
2–3—226, 231; N. 1030
3—135; N. 553
6–7—N. 840
7—N. 816
8–9—122; NN. 61, 463, 522, 582
13–14—230; N. 1030
16–18—N. 158
17–20—N. 297
19—N. 297
23–28—75; N. 294
23–29—75
25—N. 860
25–26—156–157; N. 673
29—75
30—228; NN. 1038, 1054
37–38—N. 416
40—N. 33
44–45—N. 958
52–54—NN. 33, 44
53–54—233
60—N. 33
68—234
71—N. 467
78–79—159, 180
81–83—24
97–98—N. 416
99—N. 74
113–117—N. 1052
140—N. 30
150—213
157—N. 844
160–161—61
181–183 — 191–192, 194, 196; N. 1052
198–199 — NN. 294, 297
209—8; N. 591
210—177
212—N. 1146
220–222—N. 1052
221–222—211; N. 975
222—N. 1054
229–230—36–37
256—25
264—146
294–295—N. 808
295—31
305—N. 560
306–309—96, 97; NN. 398, 409
307—103; N. 410
335—N. 297, 1010
338–339—87; N. 543
360—187
365–366—N. 428
369–370—N. 497
375–376—N. 706
380—192
831—N. 404
389—N. 406
422—208, 209
426—NN. 613, 818
437—N. 428
446–447—160; NN. 645, 774
446–449—83
454–456 — 96–97; NN. 398, 433
466–493—N. 102
469–472—59; N. 257
471–472—N. 102
474–478—N. 102
475—166, 175; NN. 693, 704, 718
479–480—N. 102
482—N. 102
483—N. 102
484—N. 102
488–489—N. 849
489—194; NN. 856, 857
504—142, 176; N. 758
507–510—N. 97
508—N. 404
510—N. 1054
510–511—N. 1050
516–517—NN. 58, 380
517—N. 569
518—N. 1052
530—N. 207
531—150
543—N. 942
545—143
565–566—244
586–587—N. 112
589–591—185–186
592–593—N. 547
611–612—228
612—NN. 1038, 1044
634–635—200; N. 904
636—159, 178
639—118, 148; NN. 592, 618
640–641—203; N. 1144
658—N. 880
684—NN. 54, 929
693–694 — 119–120, 124, 177; NN. 468, 476, 487 1102.
696—N. 1055
715—146; N. 44
734—N. 349
742—218; N. 991
742–746—94, 97; N. 166
743—196; N. 569

Aeneid 2

5–6—40; N. 579
18—N. 891
21–23—114, 140; N. 591
34—98–99; NN. 745, 774, 929
36–37—144; N. 616
45–48—NN. 61, 365
49—NN. 295, 463
54—N. 774
57—6; NN. 25, 896
70–72—51
72—152; N. 627
74–75—36; N. 379
75—N. 379
86–87—115, 164; N. 592
91—N. 376
92—146
97–99—N. 297
100—N. 297
108–111—33; N. 141
110—NN. 295, 305
116—216
120–121—33; N. 148
121—NN. 150, 166
134—N. 153
138–140—55
139—N. 209
162–170—N. 297
164—N. 297
169–170—31; N. 150
176–177—N. 148
179—7–8; NN. 181, 1078
181—N. 818
183–184—19
193–194—30; NN. 115, 717
202—N. 101
203–209—22
209—22
210—152
213—23
219—5; NN. 118, 896
227—N. 72
250–252—206, 231
250–253—22
254–259—22
258–259—NN. 778, 781, 795
259—23
260—23
264—206; N. 603
296—237
306—N. 753
310–312 — 191–192, 200; NN. 591, 1043
319—236
323—N. 112
336–337—179
337–338—179
348–349—201, 202; N. 1112
355–358—56
358—237
364–366—18
376–377—N. 297
378—151
389—207
389–390—N. 936
390—N. 929
391–393—N. 807
392—207; N. 718
394—225; N. 1050
405–406—151
412—176, 199; NN. 911, 917, 938
413–414—172, 178
414–415—N. 849
438–441—N. 900
453—208; N. 921
453–455—N. 273
467–468—225; N. 1064
470—177
471—N. 214
475—N. 44
477—N. 521
487–488—105; N. 791
507–508—110, 215; N. 421
527—237
529–530—N. 672
531—242
532—152
534—151; N. 635
541–542—159
543—N. 718
548–549—219, 244; N. 378
549—N. 378
560—NN. 952, 954
560–563—197–198
561–562—N. 954
562–563—188, 209–210; NN. 605, 975
563—N. 957
567–569—N. 97
571–573—220
578–582—N. 96
589–592—138
591–592—NN. 144, 1044
601—NN. 868, 880
601–603—198
622–623—238
632—N. 1055
642–643—37
651—N. 44
654—145; NN. 595, 606
679–680—N. 97
680—163
688—151
695–697—110
705–706—26
716—N. 706
738–740—NN. 485, 572
780—142
799—150, 152–153, 154; N. 615

Aeneid 3

8–10—N. 112
13–15—143
19—225; N. 1036
58—229; N. 1056
60–61—20
61—20
90–91—231
90–92—NN. 580, 1044, 1052, 1073, 1098
99–100—105
107–109—62; N. 268
125–127—225; N. 1063
129—192; N. 1030
136—146
137—146
140–142—32, 102; N. 150
149—N. 232
156—236
170–171—192; N. 1030
172–176—NN. 294, 307, 485
176–177—151
177—N. 776
180–181—112; N. 1006
211–212—224
222–223—226; N. 1051
234—N. 148
234–235—35; N. 150
235—N. 148
236–237—25
247—216; NN. 950, 951, 965
256–257—181
275—N. 834
281–282—29
300–305—N. 97
304–305—42
319—N. 273
323—N. 407
325—N. 706
326–327 — 219; N. 1001
327–328—143
329—11–12; N. 452
337—NN. 166, 774
344–348—N. 97
365–366—113–114
381–382—56
389—N. 511
398—N. 1052
414—9
420–425—80–81
426—198

429–432—29
431—N. 121
448–449—184; N. 604
457—183; NN. 629, 764, 1142
458–460—93; N. 372
475—N. 1010
497—198
521–523—N. 97
555–556—215; N. 965
558–559—N. 158
561–562—25; N. 1060
584—N. 407
607–608—N. 155
614–615 — 75–77; NN. 137, 138, 295
615—NN. 138, 293, 485
634—N. 521
649—231
655—N .112
665—N. 295
666–668—32, 102; N. 150
714—N. 158

Aeneid 4

5—N. 262
20—N. 955
20–21—215–216
35–36—10–11
45—226
47—110–111; N. 687
50—N. 209
69–71—59; N. 215
83—N. 54
88–89—206–207; NN. 949, 1044
90—N. 171
90–91—56; N. 234
95—N. 929
102–103—11; N. 64
112—N. 165
132—206
138–139—83
140—228; NN. 1038, 1054
144—N. 397
167—177, 182; N. 765
168—N. 791
175–176—133
176–177—82, 171; NN. 604, 1019
179–180—117–118
182–183—84
192—N. 1010
195—N. 605
200—26–27; N. 128
211–213—40
227–228—25; N. 124
234—N. 415
235–236—NN. 262, 265
246–251—N. 842
247–249—40
248–251—66; N. 286
251—NN. 168, 228
262–264—57; NN. 30, 240
274—N. 997
274–275—NN. 965, 987, 991, 1001
288—N. 1052
293–294—97
307–308—217; NN. 964, 965, 972
337—N. 376
378—104
420—N. 407
423—181
431–432—98
433—181
445–446—170–171; NN. 592, 604, 1019
483–485—89
487–490—222
494–497—34
507–508—N. 146
510–511—227; NN. 829, 1046, 1052, 1073
511—199; N. 904
517–519—153, 182; N. 776
519–520—N. 830
528—154, 214
537–538—NN. 786, 1009
544—196; NN. 160, 863
550–551—N. 416
590–591—N. 96
597—142
611–612—N. 273
615—143
620—125
621—152
627—140; N. 365
649—154; NN. 643, 662
663—N. 179
663–664—26
668–671—N. 181
674—N. 281
679—182; N. 1076
682—N. 816
690—31
693–694—159, 178
697—125; NN. 502, 503, 523

Aeneid 5

5–6—157
28–29—N. 61
28–31—138
35–36—N. 430
53–54—181
59–60—31, 98; NN. 134, 136, 150
62–63—137
64–65—189
75—235
82–83—N. 416
85—N. 1073
103—N. 1146
109–110—18
117—N. 715
118–120—63
132–133—121
148–149—171–172, 178
151–152—N. 977
152—177
152–154—63, 132; N. 558
157–158—126
159–161—N. 97
178—167
179—167
185–186—135–136
185–187—132–133; NN. 551, 564
186—NN. 576, 1055
187—N. 591
193—N. 220
214—233–234; N. 1086
220–221—15–16; N. 535
239—N. 1048
240—228
241–242—N. 1048
250–253—54; N. 215
287–289—NN. 215, 218
288—N. 228
310—243
311–312—162; NN. 687, 699, 917
318–319—N. 894
320—N. 561
323–324—55
324—N. 54
327–328—124; NN. 79, 514
327–329—N. 97
333–334—135; N. 553
334—159, 178; N. 756
340–341—221, 229, 238
341—N. 816
342—N. 929
343–344—158–159, 179
355—N. 860
357–358—N. 880
380—172, 175; NN. 688, 693
394—N. 860
394–396—N. 297
397–398—40
401–403—55; N. 238
403—N. 228
407–408—N. 937
410—225; N. 1064
412–414—N. 158
415—N. 295
429–431—N. 563

429–432—132; N. 549
430—163; N. 728
431—150
447–448—128; NN. 54, 487, 528, 539, 700, 701
448–449—16; NN. 535, 611
457—N. 563
461–462—84; N. 93
474–476—N. 166
484—144
492—N. 260
498—124; NN. 487, 514
508—150, 152–153
512—145
521—144
522—N. 717
522–523—163
536—N. 943
553–559—N. 332
560—N. 1073
563–571—194; N. 833
563–572—84–85
569—114; NN. 54, 333, 449
570–571—163
577—238
580–595—N. 332
582—N. 672
588–591—N. 332
589–590—206
591—NN. 485, 930
596—N. 158
606—184
608—175, 184; N. 295
615–616—N. 416
617—N. 407
619—N. 880
621—N. 715
640—183
655–656—218; N. 991
664–665—N. 412
665—N. 405
678—154
684—183
690—N. 153
693–694—N. 112
704–708—N. 297
729—201, 202; N. 1112
731–732—N. 832
733–735—235–236
734—N. 1073
737—93
744—190
746—229
747–748—93
750–751—201, 202; N. 1112
752–754—114–115; N. 540
758—N. 816
769—N. 407
772–773—21
781–784—48
808–809—149
809—152–153
822–824—198–199
823—N. 1047
823–824—N. 849
830—N. 521
850–851—N. 463
852—N. 295

Aeneid 6

20–30—N. 102
27—N. 485
27–29—N. 297
29—206; NN. 102, 929
32–33—N. 954
41—N. 832
43—NN. 1073, 1098
53—N. 832
57—182–183
59—N. 1055
64–65—204, 211
65—N. 919
69–70—N. 804
81—N. 832
83–84—75; N. 296
86–87—218
100–101—39
108—242–243
112–113—207; N. 949
129—N. 158
136—N. 569
158–159—60; N. 171
179–182—5, 19; NN. 167, 358
180–182—203
181—203
188—N. 376
192—N. 107
215–217—51
230—182; NN. 617, 1078
255—172; N. 726
264–265—227; NN. 1052, 1073
266—N. 376
269—N. 832
275—N. 839
277—N. 924
278—N. 839
280—191
283–284—58, 222–223
285–289—197
287—241
296—118
298–299—NN. 468, 1102
302–304—133–134
306–307—200; N. 891
317—37; N. 297
317–318—N. 297
335–336—N. 706
349–350—52–53
367–370—74; NN. 294, 297
403—149–150; N. 636
411–413—N. 1024
416—16, 145; N. 435
425—N. 6
426–427—217; NN. 965, 966
437—N. 407
448–449 — 115, 174–175; N. 485
461–462—18–19; NN. 82, 84
464—105
468—23
469–470—23–24
471—24
479–480—198; N. 591
480—N. 907
490—237
491—N. 25
500—N. 714
502–504—104
532–533—NN. 61, 365, 368, 498, 582
540–543—144; N. 604
541—N. 797
542–543—37, 183; N. 604
549–551—59
553–554—205; N. 885
557–558—215
558—N. 991
571—241
572—N. 1137
573–574—N. 330
576—N. 1139
576–577—241; N. 1135
577—N. 1137
590–591—147
592–593—213
592–594—NN. 563, 958
608–610—40
620–101
623—143; NN. 601, 607, 613, 626
638—N. 1093
640–641 — 120–121, 124; NN. 40, 529
660—166
660–664—137–138; N. 462
662—166; NN. 376, 462, 693, 704
663–664—166
679—N. 716
680—169; N. 734
681—N. 716
692—N. 609
713—N. 297
715—179; NN. 617, 772, 792
728–729—90, 196

734—177; N. 1097
739—230
743–744—229–230; N. 604
745–746—230
748–751—230
756–759—93
758—169
771–772—N. 265
792—N. 714
817–818 — 202, 204–205, 215; NN. 605, 630, 918, 932
827—139; N. 587
838–839—N. 840
839—N. 714
860–862—134; NN. 285, 338, 537
861—118
891–892—93; N. 370
893–896—66–67; N. 485

Aeneid 7

10—N. 253
15—172, 178
17–20—197
18—N. 868
21–23—59, 184; NN. 261, 604
30—N. 1093
41–42—218; N. 378
41–44—216; N. 441
50–51—176, 184; N. 604
54–55—225, 226; N. 1063
55—N. 1029
59–60—164–165, 175
59–63—43; N. 169
61—N. 171
61–62—N. 816
79—161
94–95—6, 243
98–101—40
149–151—103–104; NN. 148, 382
150—N. 379
150–151—NN. 158, 382
170—N. 615
172—147
173–176—NN. 158, 615
176—N. 816
180—198
181–182—115; N. 739
189–191—58
201—NN. 107, 108
213—N. 714
216–217—9
228—N. 706
234–235—N. 390
235—143, 160–161
251–254—82–83
257–258—137; N. 454
318–319—26
326—199
328–329—84; N. 880
330—59
346–347—NN. 1128,1134, 1137
356—N. 295
357—127
358—116, 143; NN. 598, 838
365–366—215
366—N. 984
371–372—N. 840
381–382—163–164
392–393—N. 297
407—146
415–416—N. 880
419—236; N. 468
420—N. 634
421–422—NN. 421, 1006
425—113
436–437—N. 412
447—NN. 1133, 1134
447–448—84
455—176, 188
468–469—19–20, 21
478—N. 616
483—118
501–502—NN. 487, 689
531—N. 889
535—200; N. 981
536—N. 889
537—N. 889
546—N. 165
552—159, 178; N. 669
575—199; NN. 868, 889
577—172; NN. 650, 726
577–579—106
580–582—73; NN. 294,297
599—N. 376
606—N. 209
609–610—203
611—N. 816
641–643—N. 849
641–644—N. 569
649–650—200; NN. 260, 891
651–654—40
658—240–242
665—243–244; N. 1147
666–669—N. 697
669—165
707—115, 168; N. 530
710–711—196; N. 867
710–717—91
712–717—N. 864
725–730—91–92; N. 441
726–728—125; N. 503
729–730—196
737–738—90
737–740—92
739–740—N. 354
741—N. 359
742–743—55; N. 1028
753—N. 1133
764—N. 674
769—180; N. 792
775—236
779–780—N. 485
803–806—N. 563
808–811—28

Aeneid 8

4–6—105
28–30—18
31—N. 1083
47—N. 560
55–56—39
57—N. 181
60–61—172, 178
84—N. 297
84–85—N. 297
86–87—N. 220
92–93—97, 111; N. 1107
99–100—50; NN.292, 310, 342, 591
100—53
103—225; N. 1036
107—N. 421
107–108—111
114—N. 714
131–133—215
159—N. 397
185–186—N. 158
200–201—180
201—N. 1026
202—147
206—N. 929
219–220—N. 44
220–221—231
226–227—148
235—N. 1086
242–246—N. 181
269–270—197
273–274—N. 654
281—229
287–288—155–156, 158, 179; NN. 645, 654
288—N. 680
293—N. 407
298—199; N. 925
300—N. 1136
310—N. 283
315–318—49, 51
326–327—181
330—228; N. 1038
356—N. 650
387–388—N. 44
404—N. 376
414–415—128

416–420—64
433—243
435–436—N. 1140
435–438—243
437–438—240; NN. 1134, 1140
444–445—128, 173
481–482—148–149
482—N. 808
508–509—219; N. 415
511–512—40
515–517—221
531—181; N. 766
548—N. 454
550—244
563–566—49; NN. 212, 274, 441, 964
566–567—51; N. 196
572–573—226; N. 1053
588—16
600–601—185
609–610—124–125, 129
617—144, 159
626–731—N. 102
630—N. 436
630–631—112
630–632—30
631—N. 102
635—193; NN. 844, 981
635–637—111–112; NN. 427, 572
638—193
639–641—N. 165
640—31
640–641—174
643—N. 102
663–664—237
671–672—132
679—N. 816
687–688—206
697—N. 295
698—228
698–699—197
705—193
705–706—192
706—N. 25
711–713—N. 842
717—172, 178
731—161

Aeneid 9

47–49—N. 112
47–52—N. 692
48–49—163; NN. 692, 695, 706, 716
71—N. 209
87—203
91—N. 805
91–92—188; N. 958
98—142
125—N. 220
150–152—181
153—N. 44
154—196; N. 867
178—N. 469
179–180—236; N. 604
192—N. 816
204—188
205–206—89
209—92; NN. 365, 1025
224–227—NN. 334, 1024
225—154
230–232—NN. 148, 411
234–235—34
241—234
258–259—190–191
269–270—16; NN. 38, 166, 535
272–273—200; N. 891
278—N. 501
289—N. 407
297–299—26; N. 717
299—30
301—122–123; N. 522
311—154
317–319—109; N. 442
325–328—87; NN. 441, 543
327—NN. 359, 452, 712
327–328—88
344–346—134
344–350—46–47; N. 231
347—N. 171
349—N. 631
354—160
359–360—243
364—243
369—104
371–372—N. 97
387–388—50; NN. 152, 215, 218, 292, 342, 591
399–400—84, 144; N. 166
399–401—N. 61
402—N. 560
402–403—121
426—N. 407
429—N. 830
438–439—N. 155
442—N. 281
449—N. 816
454–455—238; N. 892
454–456—236
458—243
471–472—167
472—N. 695
478–480—N. 567
479–480—176
488–489—57
489—N. 228
507—32, 102; N. 409
509–510—102
516–518—N. 104
525—N. 30
530–534—56
542–544—175
549–550—110; N. 976
556–557—237
559—148; N. 616
585—N. 674
592–594—49
593—137
595–596—172
598—143–144
603–604—147
604—NN. 625, 772
649–651—185
651—N. 620
654–655—N. 415
659—237
680—17; N. 1093
686—N. 25
692—N. 405
695—236
702–704—75; N. 294
702–705—88, 99; NN. 297, 302, 390, 543
704—NN. 345, 460
716—N. 1138
734—N. 880
473–744—118
745–746—N. 672
748—159–160, 176
760—160
774–775—N. 275
775–776—100
783—165; NN. 295, 699
794–795—N. 25
795–796—N. 563
796—237
811–812—228, 229; NN. 1037, 1038, 1067
813–814—NN. 167, 294, 295, 297, 307, 485

Aeneid 10

3–4—232, 234
12–13—215
14—30
15—N. 165
23–24—17
31–32—17; N. 535
36–41—417
51–52—195
55–56—29; N. 110
55–57—100; N. 92
70—N. 600
71—219
92—N. 1055
105–106—39; N. 165
149—NN. 155, 715
149–152—94
161–162—92; N. 569
168–169—7

181—N. 70
182–184—92
188—N. 30
190—177; N. 483
200–201—133–134
209–210—172
237—237
242–243—57
243—N. 228
267–268—225
273–274—105
280–282—27
281–282—156; NN. 654, 659
282–283—173
283—N. 652
284—N. 652
285–286—N. 166
301—24; N. 115
305–307—54; N. 245
313–314—17
323—N. 281
327–330—130–131
328–330—NN. 441, 459
329–330—NN. 54, 700, 1073
330–331—N. 542
330–332—130
338–339—N. 54
347–348—151
352–353—N. 849
361—N. 54
364–365—N. 25
369–372—344; N. 73
375–376—N. 54
384–385—N. 563
401–404—59–60
421–422—181
431—149, 152–153
435–436—137
442—N. 157
442–443—N. 155
460—143
496–497—207–208; NN. 886, 915, 1144
499—N. 940
501–502—101
504–505—182; N. 644
518–520—56
520—N. 228
524—N. 954
553—207
570–571—238
600—N. 54
608—74; NN. 102, 294, 295
613–614—40
618—N. 571
619–620—153, 182; NN. 620, 776
642—N. 61
667—151; N. 776
670—14; NN. 498, 582
672—236
673–675—56
674—N. 228
692—148
695—172; N. 407
698–699—N. 900
699—N. 880
702–706—63–64
703–705—N. 110
707–711—170
713—148
716—148
732–733—N. 1010
734—124
734–735—12–13; NN. 54, 58, 275
739–740—126
751—N. 54
755–756—159, 178
758–759—103
763–767—N. 723
767—N. 579
785–786—N. 107
786—N. 406
791–793—244
794–795—174
810—N. 155
811—NN. 262, 265
813–814—128–129
821—242–243
842—165–166; NN. 54, 539
853—213–214
857–860—N. 529
858–859—N. 158
858–860—N. 329
866—103, 220
874—N. 297
874–875—N. 297
882–884—NN. 244, 750
885–886—N. 244
888–889—30
902—N. 165
907—N. 376
908—N. 633

Aeneid 11

22–23—238
41—N. 1029
42–44—N. 415
64–65—177
67–71—54
72–75—57; N. 240
75—N. 228
81–82—6
83–84—21
100–101—174
101—31
121—242
122–123—172, 178
124—149–150, 158; NN. 54, 551, 636
139–140—N. 155
141—104
159—175; NN. 703, 748
169—N. 1010
170—225
174—N. 609
180–181—101, 102–103; N. 605
215–216—202
227—104
233—180; N. 792
249–250—94; N. 166
264–272—106–109
284—213; N. 958
291—149–150; N. 636
292—149
306–307—48
330–332—N. 165
336–337—N. 960
336–339—201; NN. 540, 1112
336–342—114–115
340–341—N. 460
348—176, 188
355–356—143
362—N. 209
364–365—48, 74; NN. 200, 293
379—N. 816
396–397—90
428—193
444—158, 179
447–448—105
449–450—196; N. 867
458—N. 1086
460—113
461—N. 376
469—N. 816
469–470—145–146, 235
477—232
494—233; NN. 1085, 1101
509–510—N. 1070
518–519—194
539—159, 179
545—N. 808
552—187
552–553—118
567–569—N. 297
569—NN. 45, 515
588—N. 397
593–594—N. 1106
603–604—193–194
615—N. 54
624—N. 220
632—N. 54
633–635—N. 485
634—N. 957

634–635 — 209, 212; NN. 260, 892, 977
641—149–150; NN. 441, 636, 687
642–643—51–52, 74, 83; NN. 54, 294, 687, 700
661–662—100; NN. 390, 443, 587
673—128; N. 732
677–678—8–9; NN. 70, 487
680–681—208; N. 949
712—N. 929
715—166
716—166
717—N. 406
729–730—N. 977
736—178
736–737—100; N. 443
736–738—113
747—237
760–761—121, 148, 149; N. 618
768—114, 162; NN. 461, 679, 694
781–784—N. 97
785–787—40; N. 157
785–788—66
790–791—225
801–802—177; N. 756
803—N. 406
820–822—40
825—N. 405
834–835—194, 196
863—NN. 969, 970
863–864—217–218; N. 765
881–883—18
887—242
896–900—104–106; N. 148
898—N. 421
900—106
901—75, 105; N. 293
903–905—N. 112
906–907—119

Aeneid 12

13—N. 165
25—N. 714
42—143; N. 598
78—N. 857
78–79—194; N. 902
95–96—N. 993
96–97—201
99—N. 466
110—213–214; NN. 456, 919
127—N. 714
134–135—NN. 204, 292, 342, 591
134–136—53
135—N. 228
150—181–182
158—N. 165
176–181—34; NN. 150, 580, 1044
177—N. 407
181–182—90
183—N. 1029
188—33, 74; NN. 137, 150
195–196—223
197–199—190; N. 1045
198–199—206
206–211—186–187; NN. 200, 342, 604
207–177
208–209—N. 813
210–211—N. 591
212—N. 165
219–222—239–240
225–226—137; NN. 168, 197
229–230—N. 161
235—NN. 605, 661
247–250—N. 97
260—N. 1055
261–263—57; N. 168
262—N. 228
273–276—N. 900
289—N. 54
289–291—115, 168; N. 155
304–306—115, 168
314—N. 165
316–317—N. 165
319–322—136; NN. 196, 310, 441, 485
320—N. 958
328–329—200; NN. 833, 891, 1043
335–336—199
348–352—47
351–352—N. 188
378–382—82
379—243
379–382—24
391–397—47
399—288; NN. 1027, 1038, 1054
416—N. 880
446–447—225
463—N. 25
464—N. 1010
475—233; N. 1086
476–477—17
488–489—187
501–502—17
514–515—NN. 714, 715
518–520—55
529–530—115, 168–169, 196–197
529–532—212–213
531—NN. 962, 987
531–532—N. 645
561—N. 1052
572—N. 158
583—N. 485
595–597—110, 112; N. 453
624—183
634–636—35; NN. 59, 61
640—165–166; NN. 54, 539
645—N. 25
656–657—242
674–675—54
682—237
736—244
738—N. 25
748—N. 54
750—N. 616
752—147
766–771—87–88; N. 543
781—31, 167; N. 321
788—150, 152–153, 154; NN. 615, 661
794—N. 1039
809—234
822—N. 165
827—N. 454
845–847—42
845–848—54
846—N. 222
847–848—N. 1137
849–850—18
856–859—167–168; NN. 689, 709
856–860—39; NN. 181, 722
859—N. 695
869—177; N. 765
876–877—N. 766
890—149; NN. 616, 620, 808
895—226
907—N. 406
917–918—93
930–931—151
943–944—60; N. 266
944—N. 228

B. Passages in Authors Other than Vergil[1157]

AESCHYLUS
Prometheus Bound
193–194—N. 54
220—N. 54
670–671—N. 54
955—N. 54

ANONYMOUS
Pervigilium Veneris
58—N. 700
Vergilian Appendix
Culex
218—N. 1137
Dirae 104–106 (= Lydia 1–3)—N. 415
Lydia
(See Dirae)
Verses Prefixed to Aeneid 1
2–3—N. 1024

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS
3.757–758—N. 609

ARATUS
969—N. 1138

ARCHILOCHUS
69—N. 54

ARISTOTLE
Poetics
1456b—N. 55
1457a—N. 55
1458a—N. 8
1458b—N. 8
1458b–1459a—N. 9

CAESAR
De Bello Gallico
1.24.4—17
2.17.2—N. 966

CATULLUS
46.10—N. 706
46.10–11—N. 706
62.45—N. 1138
64.112—N. 297
65.19–24—N. 181
101—N. 273
101.1—N. 706

CICERO
Cato Maior
85—N. 373
Epistulae ad Atticum
9.2a.3—N. 376
9.13.1—N. 376
9.13.8—N. 376
Oratio pro Milone
63—N. 376
Orationes in Catilinam
1.4—N. 39
Orationes in Verrem
4.9—N. 169
Paradoxa Stoicorum
6.50—N. 376
Tusculanae Disputationes
1.65—N. 307

COLUMELLA
4.25.1—N. 1145

DONATUS
Commentum Terenti Eunuchus 269—N. 307

DONATUS = SUETONIUS
Vita Vergilii
44—N. 7

ENNIUS
Annales
23—N. 267
187–191—19
Epigrammata
18—NN. 605, 661
Lytra
186—244

EURIPIDES
Electra
85–87—N. 174
427–429—N. 93
592–593—N. 628
Iphigenia in Tauris
31—N. 54
511—N. 61
Medea
513—N. 54
805–806—N. 54
Phoenissae
1134–1137—240

FESTUS
514—N. 1147

GELLIUS
9.14.7—N. 51
10.29—N. 179
13.21—N. 396
13.21.4—N. 396

HESIOD
Works and Days
804—N. 1138

HOMER
Iliad
1.24—N. 900
2.783—N. 1138
3.7—N. 1138
5.79–80—N. 900
5.311–317—N. 111
5.343–346—N. 111
5.431–453—N. 111
7.14–16—N. 900
11.420–421—N. 900
13.131—N. 54
23—N. 358

HORACE
Carmen Saeculare
18–19—N. 956
Carmina
1.1.3–5—N. 393
1.1.19–21—N. 393
1.2—N. 1042
1.3.1–8—N. 485
1.3.32–33—205
1.3.38–40—N. 262
1.6.8—N. 871
1.9.23–24—N. 24
1.11.4—N. 319
1.11.4–5—N. 574
1.12.18—N. 1041
1.24.6–8—N. 259
1.26.1—N. 275
1.26.1–3—102
1.38—NN. 291, 485
2.13.29–30—N. 434
2.13.34—N. 1139
2.13.35–36—N. 1137
2.20—NN. 605, 661
3.2.9—N. 416
3.29.64—N. 275
3.30.6–7—NN. 605, 661
4.3.10–11—N. 352
4.15.1—N. 376
Epistulae
1.1.91—N. 386
1.7.27–28—NN. 46, 82
1.7.79—NN. 46, 82
Epodon Liber
16.48—N. 220
Sermones
1.2.100—N. 415
1.5.72—N. 485
1.5.87—4
1.5.104—N. 606
1.6.77–78—N. 146
1.6.92–93—N. 260
2.3.262–263—N. 307
2.3.308—N. 146
2.5.62—168
2.8.39–40—N. 706

JUVENAL
3.4–5—N. 468
3.48—N. 39
8.149–150—N. 830
13.147–148—N. 468
14.217—N. 1145

[1157]Compare note 1156.

LIVY
Praefatio 6—N. 694
1.3.6–11—N. 816
1.43.6—N.1147
4.41.8—N. 1024
5.45.3—N. 62
5.54.5—N. 376
8.9.6—NN. 1040, 1042
21.1.4—N. 39
21.46.10—N. 169
22.25.3—N. 297
23.8.3—N. 169
24.11.7—N. 169
35.11.10—N. 341

LUCILIUS
228–229—4

LUCRETIUS
1.114–116—N. 1024
1.741—N. 54
2.16–23—N. 295
2.23—N. 295
3.894–895—N. 1085
6.7—N. 295

OVID
Ars Amatoria
1.746—N. 275
Ex Ponto
4.12.1–16—4
4.12.20—N. 54
4.12.22—N. 54
Metamorphoses
1.526—N. 634
1.528—N. 56
4.148–149—N. 776
10.588–590—N. 290
10.644—N. 207
10.644–647—N. 169
10.649–50—N. 817
15.861–867 — NN. 1041, 1042
15.878–879—N. 605

PLATO
Menexenes
247 C—N. 54

PLAUTUS
Amphitruo
455–457—N. 61
833–834—N. 54
844—N. 61
Asinaria
717—N. 61
Menaechmi
321–322—N. 376

PLINY THE ELDER
3.82—N. 1138
17.28—N. 307

PLINY THE YOUNGER
Epistulae
3.5.8—N. 39

PRISCIAN
1034 (Putsch) = 646 (Krehl)—N. 492

QUINTILIAN
8.3.56—N. 7
9.3.16—N. 1138
9.3.58—N. 132

SENECA
Agamemnon
260—N. 181
497–498—NN. 54, 181
499–500—N. 181
Medea
182—N. 166
Phaedra
179–183—N. 181
Thyestes
436–439—N. 181

SOPHOCLES
Antigone
73—N. 54
366—N. 609
787–790—N. 609
851—N. 609
1176—N. 609
1279–1289—N. 322
Oedipus at Colonus
1258–1259—N. 54
Oedipus Tyrannus
734—N. 609
761—N. 609

SULPICIA
10.1 (= Tibullus 3.13.10 or 4.7.10)—N. 54

TACITUS
Historiae
3.8—N. 948

TERENCE
Adelphoe
468—N. 61
Eunuchus
46–47—N. 307
269—N. 307

THEOCRITUS
1.134—N. 1138
2.82—N. 1138
3.9—N. 1138

THUCYDIDES
7.44.7—N. 54

TIBULLUS
(See Sulpicia)

TYRTAEUS
9.31–33—N. 54

VALERIUS FLACCUS
3.596—N. 281
8.171–174—N. 281
8.174—N. 774

II. INDEX RERUM[1158]

A

'Ab urbe condita' construction—100, 108–109, 112, 113, 193, 239–240, NN. 92, 378, 412, 435, 655, 1120, 1125.
Ablative, absolute—122, 123, 149, NN. 215, 306, 500, 522; with proper noun—N. 39. See *Dignor*, *Pascor*, Piling up.
Accusative, of 'Affekt' and 'Effekt'—NN. 754, 760, 773, 780, 795, 818. See *Clamo*, *Loquor*, *Moto*, *Pascor*, Piling up, *Posco*, *Reclamo*, *Reposco*, *Stipo*.
Action *vs.* state—see State *vs.* action.
Adaptation of form to sense—19, 77, 82, 85, 120, 175, 188, 209, NN. 74, 167, 181, 291, 303, 307, 485, 572, 642, 652, 659.
Adjective, = genitive of substantive—116, 161, 191, 196, 197, 203, NN. 650, 867, 884, 933, 960. See Epithets, Participles, Piling up, Possessive adjective.
Adverb introducing a clause—15, 40, 50, 61–62, 92–93, 97–98, 100, 138–139, NN. 215, 218, 265, 364, 374, 377, 587.
Adversative use—see *Et.*
'Affekt'—see Accusative, of 'Affekt' and 'Effekt'.
Alius, omitted—224–231, NN. 61, 365, 498; used redundantly—N. 1024.
Alliteration—114 (*bis*), NN. 450, 679.
Ambiguous expression—112, 127, 136, 216, NN. 196, 441, 528, 572, 978. See Classification: exact grammatical classification impossible.
Amoenus, used of places—N. 1093.
Anacoluthon—17, 75, 87, 122, NN. 61, 297, 307, 338, 339, 359, 900.
Anaphora—39, N. 687.
Antithesis—see Contrast.
Apollonius Rhodius—N. 1138.
Apposition—106, 113, 114, 143, 168, 197, 199, 201, 202, 207, 220, NN. 652, 714, 873, 882, 887, 1031; partitive apposition—115, 201, 202, 235, NN. 900, 1044, 1052, 1073, 1112.
Arma—see Combinations.
Asyndeton—N. 652. See Connective repetition.
At, force of—NN. 270, 273.
Atque, causal—166; emphasizes what follows—N. 180; = 'and lo'—26; = *statim*—N. 179; *atque*. . .*et*—N. 429.
Ausonii, meaning of—N. 1029.
Authors—see Apollonius Rhodius, Caesar, Catullus, Cicero, Elegiac poets, Horace, Imitation, Livy, Lucretius, Ovid, Plautus, Sallust, Sophocles, Tacitus, Terence. See also Index Locorum.

B

Body, confused with man—see Confusion. See *Corpus*.

C

Cacozelia—N. 7.
Caesar—N. 1154.
Cases—see Ablative, Accusative, Dative, Genitive.
Catullus—N. 386.
Causal use—see *Atque*, *Neque*, *-Que*.
Ceteri, omitted—224–231; used redundantly—N. 1024.
Change of state *vs.* state—see State *vs.* change of state.
Chiasmus—19, NN. 687, 954, 987, 991, 1024.
Cicero—245–246, NN. 169, 606, 1154.
Clamo, transitive or intransitive—N. 281. See *Reclamo*.
Classification: exact grammatical classification impossible—117–118, 147–150, 206, NN. 33, 44, 402, 446, 477, 500, 522, 615, 620, 621, 650, 819, 919, 944, 978; exact logical classification departed from—12–13, 81, NN. 18, 26, 30, 58, 63, 151, 152, 302, 367, 388, 592; overlapping of categories—115, 171, 178, 179, 200, 203, NN. 18, 31, 592, 594, 595, 640, 666, 752, 772, 786, 787, 792, 804, 907, 909, 919, 934, 965, 987, 1142.
Clause, coordinated with non-clause—NN. 587, 589.
Climax—163, 205, N. 954.
Collective noun—NN. 25, 27.
Combinations, common: *arma* and *vir*—NN. 855, 1105; *equus* and *arma*—N. 70; *nomen* and *genus*—NN. 715, 870.
Compendiary comparison—NN. 260, 895.
Concilium, meaning of—146, 235.
Confusion, of *genus* and *nomen*—N. 715; of geographical and ethnographical terms—N. 840; of man and his body—N. 1106; of object and its name—50–51.

[1158] This Index makes no pretension to exhaustiveness. It aims merely to supplement the Table of Contents.

Conington, style of—NN. 175, 247.
Conjunctions—see *Atque*, Connective, Correlative, *Cum*, *Enim*, *Et*, *Neque*, *Quam*, *-Que*, *Sed*, *Tum*, *Ut*, *-Ve*.
Conjunctive adverb—see Adverb introducing a clause.
Connecting Relative—see Relative.
Connective, used in a parenthesis—67–77, N. 205. Connective contrast—8, 114, 133, NN. 342, 551, 591, 622. Connective repetition—98, 100–101, 244, NN. 46, 71, 73, 82, 84, 119, 125, 551, 591, 600, 623, 670, 769, 775, 788, 833, 860, 875, 878, 901, 903, 912, 979, 1003, 1073, 1100, 1109, 1141, 1150. Connective variant repetition—NN. 69, 166, 225, 551, 591, 623, 885, 912, 925, 1028. Connective or correlative—see Correlative or connective; connective or emphatic *enim*—see *Enim;* connective or emphatic *neque*—see *Neque*. See Conjunctions.
Construction—see Cases, *Clamo*, *Dignor*, *Foedera iungo*, *Invideo*, *Loquor*, *Moto*, *Pascor*, *Posco*, *Reclamo*, *Reposco*, *Stipo*, *Turbo*.
Continuo, force of—N. 316.
Contrast—47, 66–67, 82, 85–86, 87, 108, 131, 132, NN. 136, 270, 290, 291, 308, 337, 342, 530, 547, 560, 591, 622. Contrast serving as connective—see Connective contrast.
Coordinating or subordinating force of *enim*—see *Enim*.
Corpus, force of, in periphrasis—N. 891; meaning of—NN. 892, 1113. See Confusion.
Correlation in thought of main word and modifier—83, 162, 165–166, 191, 194 (three times), 195, 221, NN. 687, 699, 712, 861, 917, 1120.
Correlative or connective—17, 34, 138, 175, NN. 72, 193, 1044, 1046, 1052, 1073; correlative used in a parenthesis—N. 205. Correlative use of *atque . . . et*—N. 429; of *-que . . . et*—175, N. 579.
Culex—N. 386.
Cum, conjunction: *cum inversum*—60, 82, NN. 97, 112, 114.
Cum, preposition: equivalent to *et*—NN. 627, 951.

D

Dactylic hexameter—see Meter.
Dative, of reference, equivalent to genitive of possession—NN. 219, 810. See Piling up.
Demonstrative pronouns, used instead of relative—41–47. See Pronouns, repeated in a different form, omitted in a different case, not to be supplied in a different form. See *Ille*, *Is*.
Diction—2–4, N. 1153.
Dignor, construction with—N. 1010.
Distribution of modifiers—9, 119, 236, NN. 468, 928.
Dolor, meaning of—156–157, N. 860.
Dolus, meaning of—206, NN. 603, 929.
Double inconcinnity neutralized—199, 208, N. 911.

E

Early writings of Vergil—201, NN. 307, 1138.
'Effekt'—N. 613; see Accusative, of 'Affekt' and 'Effekt'.
Elegiac poets—NN. 121, 122.
Elegiac verse—28, N. 121.
Ellipsis—NN. 295, 297.
Emphatic use, of *et*—see *Et;* of *neque*—see *Neque;* of *neque* in *neque enim*—see *Neque*.
Enim, connective or affirmative—N. 297; coordinating or subordinating—N. 297; *at enim*—N. 297; *enimvero*—N. 297; *neque enim*—N. 297; *sed enim*—N. 297.
Enimvero—N. 297.
Epexegetical use, of *et*—see *Et;* of *-que*—see *-Que*.
Epithets: stock epithets—NN. 620, 808, 1054; transferred epithets—125, 202, 207, NN. 791, 932. See Distribution, Piling up.
Equus—see Combinations.
Et, adversative—N. 45; emphatic—74, NN. 295, 463; epexegetical—139; illative—N. 45; = *et . . . quidem*—see *Et* emphatic; = *itaque*—see *Et* illative; = *sed*—see *Et* adversative; in a parenthesis—67, N. 293; *atque . . . et*—N. 429; *-que . . . et*—175, N. 579.
Ethnographical terms—192; see Confusion.
Exclamatory infinitive—see Infinitive.

F

Facies, force of, in periphrasis—N. 881; meaning of—198, 238, N. 880.
Fero = *nuntio*—104.
Figurative language—144–150, 150, 151, 152, 182, 183; NN. 601, 617, 685, 772, 776, 786, 797. See Figures.
Figures—see Alliteration, Anacoluthon, Anaphora, Antithesis, Asyndeton, Chiasmus, Climax, Compendiary comparison, Hendiadys, Hypallage, '*Hysteron proteron*', Meta-

phor, Metonymy, Parataxis, Personification, Prolepsis, Simile, Tmesis, Zeugma.
Foedera iungo, construction with—39, N. 165.
Forma, force of, in periphrasis—197.
Fusion—1, 6 (*bis*), 8, 11, 14, 43, 44, 48, 58, 61, 63, 72–73, 74, 78, 81–82, 83, 88, 89, 100, 114, 115, 130, 131, 132, 134, 136, 138, 139, 166, 195, 197, 198, 200, 202–203, 203, 204, 205, 211, 212, 213 (*bis*), 218 (three times), 219, 220 (*bis*), 239–240, NN. 51, 102, 206, 285, 295, 310, 463, 537, 745, 860, 910, 959.

G

Genitive, possessive, equivalent to dative of reference—NN. 219, 810; subjective and objective—155–156, 161, 212–213, 242, NN. 645, 650, 675; type of, in periphrasis—NN. 919, 944; with proper noun—N. 39; replaced by adjective—see Adjective. See Piling up.
Genus, force of, in periphrasis—N. 868. See Combinations, Confusion.
Geographical terms—192. See Confusion.
Gerundive, in '*ab urbe condita*' phrase—N. 964; with *super*—211.
Gods, effort not to omit—224–225. See *Indigetes*.

H

Haverfield, method of, in revising Conington—NN. 90, 534, 759, 944.
Hendiadys—118, 172, 240, 243, NN. 3, 465, 504, 598, 601, 602, 615, 617, 619, 625, 656, 669, 726, 735, 863, 931, 962, 987, 1001, 1073, 1075, 1085, 1107, 1118.
Hexameter—see Meter.
Historical infinitive—see Infinitive.
Historical present—21, NN. 100, 102, 103, 375.
Horace—3, 214, NN. 122, 319.
Hydra, meaning of—240–241.
Hydrus, meaning of—N. 1133.
Hypallage—118, 199, 200, 201, 202, 214, N. 988. See Epithets, transferred; Verbs, transferred.
'*Hysteron proteron*'—26–27, 30, 174, 184; NN. 240, 426, 519, 783, 1056.

I

Idiom, violation of—NN. 169, 184, 189, 214, 340, 343, 457.
Illative use—see *Et*, *-Que*.
Ille, pleonastic use of—136, NN. 553, 563, 567; used to provide smoothness, N. 311.
Imitation: imitation by Vergil, of Aratus—N. 1138; of Catullus—NN. 181, 706; of Ennius—244, NN. 207, 605, 661; of Euripides—240–242; of Hesiod—N. 1138; of Homer—N. 1138; of Theocritus—N. 1138. Imitation of Vergil, by author of Pervigilium Veneris—N. 700; by Ovid—N. 207; by Seneca—N. 181; by Valerius Flaccus—NN. 281, 774. Imitation of Ennius by Horace and Ovid—NN. 605, 661. Imitation of Terence by Horace—N. 307. Imitations, value of, for interpretation—NN. 181, 700.
Implied indirect discourse—104, 106, NN. 148, 149.
Indigetes, meaning of—226–227.
Indirect discourse—see Implied indirect discourse.
Infinitive, exclamatory—N. 416; historical—31–32, 102, NN. 132, 589, 1018; past = present—N. 121; with relative—42.
Insidiae, meaning of—144, N. 616.
Instituo, meaning of—222, N. 1016.
Intensive pronoun—NN. 168, 530, 576.
Interlocked word-order—NN. 970, 991, 997.
Interrogative pronouns—see Pronouns, repeated in a different form, not to be supplied in a different form.
Intransitive use of verbs—see Verbs.
Invideo, construction with—N. 415.
Inviso, meaning of—N. 397.
Ipse, used to intensify contrast—128, N. 530. See Intensive pronoun.
Is, pleonastic use of—N. 297.

L

Laus, meaning of—155, 158, NN. 649, 654, 860.
Livy—214, 246, NN. 169, 1154.
Loquor, transitive and intransitive, 15; with accusative substantive, N. 376.
Lucretius—N. 169.

M

Maneo, tense use of—26, 30, N. 717.
Meaning of Latin words—see *Amoenus*, *Atque*, *Ausonii*, *Concilium*, *Continuo*, *Dolor*, *Dolus*, *Enim*, *Et*, *Facies*, *Fero*, *Hydra*, *Hydrus*, *Indigetes*, *Insidiae*, *Instituo*, *Inviso*, *Laus*, *Mucro*, *Neque*, *Nidus*, *Patres*, *Perfero*, *Purpura*, *-Que*, *Res*, *Res rapio*, *Sedeo*, *Si*, *Sido*, *Silvae*, *Sin*, *Tum*, *Tumultus*, *Turbo*, *-Ve*, *Veru*.

Means *vs.* result—see Result *vs.* means.
Metaphor—54, 152, 182, NN. 617, 653, 772, 797.
Meter: exigencies of dactylic hexameter—4, 5, 19–20, 26–27, 28 (*bis*), 83, 110, 203, 245, NN. 24, 25, 102, 118, 121, 122, 740, 896, 921; metrical harshness—NN. 303, 485; adaptation of meter to sense—NN. 303, 485. See Elegiac verse.
Metonymy—143, 154–157, 160, 176, 178, NN. 654, 672, 753, 860, 1030.
Mistranslation (?) of Greek—N. 1138.
Modal use—see *Posco*, *Spero*, *Voco*.
Modifier correlated in thought with main word—see Correlation.
Moods, use of—see Infinitive.
Moto, transitive or intransitive—18.
Mucro, meaning of—243–244, N. 1145.

N

Name, confused with object—see Confusion.
-Ne, with infinitive of exclamation—N. 416.
Nec—see *Neque*.
Necdum—NN. 294, 295, 748.
Neque, causal, 175, N. 703; copulative or emphatic, N. 295; copulative or emphatic, in expression *neque enim*—N. 297; = *ne*—N. 295; = *ne... quidem*—N. 307; = *neque enim*—N. 307; = *non*—NN. 295, 297, 307; in parenthesis—67, N. 294; with participle—N. 748; not used with relative—NN. 189, 190, 226.
Neque enim—NN. 294, 297.
Nettleship, method of, in revising Conington—N. 90.
Neutralization of double inconcinnity—199, 208, N. 911.
Nidus, meaning of—233–234, N. 1086.
Nomen—see Combinations, Confusion.
Nouns: repeated in a different case—N. 155; see Repetition, verbal. See Cases, Collective noun.

O

Object of verb: see Accusative; Verbs, objects not in same relation to verb; Verbs, transitive and intransitive use of verb.
Objective genitive—see Genitive, subjective and objective.
Omission, of *alius*—see *Alius*; of *ceteri*—see *Ceteri*; of indicative of *sum*—115, 130–136, 137, N. 342; of *quod*—99; of subjunctive auxiliary—NN. 362, 366, 569, 571; of a different word in each of two coordinate members—N. 319; of a word in a different case—36–39, 47–58.
Ora, force of, in periphrasis—199.
Oratio obliqua—see Indirect discourse.
Order of ideas: *aba*—N. 273.
Order of words: *aba*—201, N. 485; *abab*—see Interlocked word-order; *abba*—see Chiasmus; suitable to sense—77, 175, NN. 74, 307, 485.
Overlapping of categories—see Classification.
Ovid—N. 606.

P

Parallelism—213, 233, NN. 273, 274, 853, 1030, 1064, 1073.
Parataxis—34.
Parenthesis—33, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 63, 67–77, 108, 113, NN. 102, 137, 141, 205, 292, 297, 342, 345, 418, 460, 536, 584. See Connective used in a parenthesis, Correlative used in a parenthesis.
Part and whole—208, NN. 821, 915, 1073. See Apposition, partitive.
Participles, coordinated with non-participles—75, 115, 121, 122, 123, 125, 135, 137–138, 139, 164–169, 172–173, 174–175, NN. 462, 470, 689; participle used with negative—N. 748; participle = adjective—164, 166, 209, NN. 695, 708, 709, 716, 717, 949, 950; present participle not accurate—57, 59, 60, 62, NN. 250, 254, 268, 312; present participle = past—NN. 491, 560; present passive participle needed—31, 211, 212; past participle = present—31, 167, 172–173, NN. 297, 321, 706, 731. See '*Ab urbe condita*', Gerundive, Piling up.
Partitive apposition—see Apposition.
Pascor, transitive or intransitive—NN. 214, 1076.
Patres, meaning of—N. 816.
Perferō, meaning of—103.
Periphrasis—N. 828. See *Corpus*, *Facies*, *Forma*, *Genus*, *Ora*.
Permanence *vs.* transience—128, 161–162, 171.
Personal pronouns—see Pronouns, repeated in a different form, omitted in a different case.
Personification—182, N. 797.
Phrase, prepositional—see Prepositional phrase.
Piling up, of ablatives—N. 44; of accusatives—205; of adjectives—NN. 169, 686, 718, 828, 928, 932, 995, 1002; of adjective and ablative—N. 468; of adjective and genitive—

N. 468; of adjective and participle—NN. 718, 995; of datives—N. 810; of genitives—N. 966; of nominatives, N. 932; of participles—121, 174, NN. 254, 736.
Plautus—NN. 116, 297.
Pleonasm—75, 117, NN. 297, 379. See Redundant use, Tautology.
Posco: with two accusatives—N. 209 (see *Reposco*); equivalent to an optative subjunctive—NN. 131, 136.
Possessive adjective—116, NN. 168, 650.
Predicate—118, 119, 120, 163–164, 220, NN. 718, 1006. Word in predicate coordinated with word not in predicate—9, 121, 124, 128, 163–164, NN. 487, 528, 689, 710.
Prepositional phrase, coordinated with different type of expression—N. 509.
Process vs. result—see Result vs. process.
Prolepsis—60, 164, N. 642.
Pronouns, repeated in a different form: demonstrative—NN. 158, 159, 162, 164; interrogative—94, N. 166; personal—N. 157; relative—40, 90, N. 66. Omitted in a different case: demonstrative—38; personal—38; relative—47–58. Not to be supplied in a different form: demonstrative—38–39; interrogative—NN. 262, 265; relative—58–67. See Demonstrative pronouns, *Ille*, Intensive pronoun, *Ipse*, *Is*, Relative.
Proper noun, with ablative or genitive—N. 39.
Punctuation, influence of—24, 59–60, NN. 98, 182, 265.
Purpura, meaning of—N. 546.

Q

Quam—N. 123.
-Que, causal—172, 175, N. 693; epexegetical—N. 193; illative—129, N. 311; = 'and especially'—226; = 'and in fact'—226; = 'including'—226; = *itaque*—see *-Que* illative; in a parenthesis—N. 293; joining closely connected members—N. 997; *-que . . . et* —175, N. 579.

R

Rapio—see *Res rapio*.
Reclamo, transitive or intransitive—65, N. 281. See *Clamo*.
Redundant use—see *Alius*, *Ceteri*, *Ille*, *Is*, Pleonasm, Tautology.
Relative: connecting relative—42, 43, 47, 56, 59, 60, NN. 234, 253, 255; coordinated with non-relative—42; relative replaced by demonstrative—41–47; relative used with infinitive—42. See Pronouns, repeated in a different form, omitted in a different case, not to be supplied in a different form. See Repetition, of idea in relative.
Repetition, of idea in relative, presented by non-relative—41–47, 66, NN. 168, 204, 215 (*bis*), 228. Verbal repetition—12, 130, 165–166, 168, NN. 54, 155, 452, 539, 687, 700, 701. See Anaphora; Connective, Connective repetition, Connective variant repetition; Nouns, repeated in a different case; Pronouns, repeated in a different form.
Reposco, with two accusatives, N. 209. See *Posco*.
Res, meaning of—155, N. 646.
Res rapio, meaning of—30.
Result *vs.* means—183–184, N. 738.
Result *vs.* process—30, 31, 112, 173, 174, NN. 74, 107, 108, 716.

S

Sallust—N. 1154.
Sed, not used with relative—NN. 184, 340, 343; *sed enim*—N. 297.
Sedeo, meaning of—NN. 107, 108; tense use of—N. 108.
Si, used instead of *cum*—189.
Sido, form of, in perfect, N. 107; meaning of—24, N. 108; tense use of—24, N. 108.
Silvae, meaning of—N. 1024.
Simile—39, 127, 171, NN. 181, 722.
Sin, meaning of—189.
Sophocles—3, NN. 609, 1153.
Spero, equivalent to an optative subjunctive—N. 136.
State *vs.* action—31, 168, 171, NN. 423, 949.
State *vs.* change of state—24.
Stipo, transitive—N. 160.
Style—see Adaptation of form to sense, Cacozelia, Construction, Contrast, Diction, Early writings of Vergil, Figures, Fusion, Meaning of Latin words, Omission, Order of ideas, Order of words, Parallelism, Repetition, Suggestiveness, Transition, Unexpectedness, Variety.
Subject—see Verbs, subjects not in same relation to verb.
Subjective genitive—see Genitive, subjective and objective.

Subordination—see Correlation in thought of main word and modifier; *Enim*, coordinating or subordinating; Verbs, coordination of two verbs either one of which may be made subordinate to other.
Suggestiveness—1, 3–4, 6, 103, 209, 210, NN. 6, 9, 404, 605, 922.
Super, with gerundive—211.

T

Tacitus—246.
Tautology—124, 128, 222. See Pleonasm, Redundant use.
Temporal clause, coordinated with different type of expression—N. 587.
Tenses, use of: see Infinitive, past = present; Participles, present participle not accurate, present participle = past, past participle = present; *Maneo, Sedeo, Sido.*
Terence—NN. 116, 297.
Tmesis—65.
Transience *vs.* permanence—see Permanence *vs.* transience.
Transition—79–80, 112, 130, 136, 216–217, NN. 87, 196, 339, 359, 427, 441, 528, 572, 624.
Transitive use of verbs—see Verbs.
Tum, not temporal—N. 287; = *deinde* —80; = *eo tempore*—80.
Tumultus, meaning of—105; supposed derivation of—105.
Turbo, construction with—N. 958; meaning of, N. 958.

Una, in combinations—N. 521.
Unexpectedness—11, 19, N. 9.
Ut, used with indicative—N. 386; used with *invideo*, N. 415; not used with *volo*—N. 147.

V

Variant repetition—see Connective variant repetition.
Variety—5, 19, 20, 28, 67, 83, 84, 100, 192, 203, 204, 209, 243, 245, NN. 333, 358, 934, 987, 1052, 1139.
-Ve, not disjunctive in questions, N. 497; = *-que*, 122, 235.
Verbal repetition—see Repetition.
Verbs: coordination of two verbs either one of which may be made subordinate to other—57, NN. 163, 244, 247, 251, 258, 263, 267, 268, 750, 1019; coordination of verbs which are not parallel logically—N. 604. Modifiers not in same relation to verb—N. 778; see also Predicate, word in predicate coordinated with word not in predicate. Objects not in same relation to verb—NN. 778, 1076; see also Accusative, of 'Affekt' and 'Effekt', Zeugma. Subjects not in same relation to verb—182, N. 778. Transferred verb—NN. 791, 967. Transitive and intransitive use of verb—15, NN. 53, 520; see also *Clamo, Loquor, Moto, Pascor, Reclamo, Stipo.* Verb used with two accusatives—see *Posco, Reposco.* See Accusative, Infinitive, Participles, Tenses, uses of.
Veru, meaning of—243–244, N. 1146.
Violation of idiom—see Idiom, violation of.
Vir—see Combinations.
Voco, equivalent to imperative—34.
Volo, not followed by *ut*—N. 147.

W

Word-order—see Order of words.

Z

Zeugma—7, 15, 15–16, 17, 18, 97, 102, 106, 143, 145, 151, NN. 3, 75, 151, 337, 409, 485, 519, 596, 601, 613, 642, 778, 781, 809, 818, 839, 840, 1076.

VITA

I was born on April 1, 1893, in the City of New York.

My mother taught me privately until I was thirteen years old. To her sound and thorough training, notably in arithmetic, algebra, English grammar, and English composition—training which always had as its prime purpose the development in the pupil of the power to think—I attribute a great part of any success that may have attended my subsequent efforts.

Although my mother prepared me for high school, she deemed it best for me to become familiar with the discipline of elementary school, and I therefore spent the year 1906–1907 in the Hunter College Model School (then known as the Training Department of Normal College).

I attended Hunter College High School from 1907 to 1911, and shall always be most grateful for the excellent preparation afforded by this institution, justly famed for its academic achievements. During the four years that I spent there, I was well drilled in the rudiments of Latin. I am particularly thankful for the inspiration that I derived from the teaching of Miss M. Olive Barrick (now Mrs. Rowland), and for the progress that I made under the masterly training of Mrs. Elizabeth Lowell Hammond.

I attended Hunter College, my mother's Alma Mater as well as my own, from 1911 to 1915, being graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1915. Here I devoted four very happy and fruitful years primarily to the study of Latin and Greek, in the admirable department headed by my esteemed friend, Professor George M. Whicher, for whose constant interest and encouragement I am under the deepest of obligations.

After my graduation from Hunter College, I pursued graduate work at Columbia University, receiving the degree of Master of Arts in 1917. I owe much to the counsels and the teachings of those professors under whose guidance it has been my privilege to come, notably Professor Clarence H. Young, Professor Nelson G. McCrea, and my faculty adviser, Professor Charles Knapp.

I am profoundly appreciative of the generosity of Columbia University, which, by awarding to me the Drisler Fellowship for the year 1916–1917, made it possible for me to devote one full year entirely to study.

BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
871V58YH2 C001
COORDINATION OF NON-COORDINATE ELEMENTS
3 28[illegible] 00083 9490